F.5.42

A DISCOURSE Concerning The OPERATIONS OF THE Holy Spirit:

WITH

A CONFUTATION of ſome part of Dr. OWEN's Book upon that Subject.

BIBL. CANT. ACAD.

Written by *WILLIAM CLAGETT*, Preacher to the Honorable Society of *Graies Inn*, and one of His Majeſties Chaplains in Ordinary.

The Second Part.

With an ANSWER TO Mr. *HUMFREY*'s Animadverſions upon the Firſt.

LONDON: Printed for *Henry Brome*, at the *Gun* in St. *Pauls Church-yard.* 1680.

AN

ANSWER

TO

Mr. JOHN HUMFREY'S ANIMADVERSIONS

Upon

The FIRST PART.

MR. *Humfrey* begins with Animadverting upon the Author, and that for not uſing Dr. *Owen* with *more reſpect*: But he did well enough not to produce thoſe *virulent paſſages*, as he calls them, which he complains of: For where the Doctor is uſed with any kinde of ſeverity; the Reaſon and Juſtice of it

is so apparent, that if Mr. *H.* would be meddling in this matter at all, he ought to have join'd with me in reproving this haughty man, instead of flattering him in his sin, by falling foul upon me, and pretending that the Doctor is *above his Vindication.* The truth is, those *sharp Reflections* upon Dr. *Owen*, which trouble his Friend, are nothing else but the Rehearsal of those odious Characters which he has bestowed upon his Adversaries at all adventure; and some few Expostulations concerning his malice in so doing. And I wonder that Mr. *H.* who is a civil Gentleman, and treateth us at another rate, should be angry, because we do not *Totum telum recipere*, and suffer defamation, injurious not onely to our selves, but to the People committed to our charge, without the least Resentment and Vindication. Does Mr. *H.* believe that *we proclaim our selves in our whole course to be Proud, Revengeful, Worldly, Sensual, Neglecters of holy Duties, Scoffers at Religion and the Power of it?* If not, one would think he should have *noted the Doctor to be a little deficient in his Ethicks and Civility*, as he has *noted* his Answerer. For he makes nothing to describe us in this Fashion, and pours such Re-

O. Spir. p. 498.

Disq. p. 109

Reproaches as theſe upon us in every Chapter of his great Book. It is ſtrange to ſee what pains he has taken to draw in his malicious Sayings againſt us: For inſtance, that he ſhould tell the Reader that *we teach our Children that the Holy Ghoſt ſanctifies all the Elect of God*; and this for nothing elſe, but to hedge in this Reproach, that *yet we deſpiſe the work of Holineſs in our ſelves, and deride it in others.* And all this, forſooth, was brought in by way of caution, leſt *others ſhould be found among the number* of ſuch *Scoffers*, ſuch *profane Scoffers*, as he frequently calls us. Was not this a pertinent Introduction to his Diſcourſe about the *Nature of Holineſs?* And yet 'tis in this manner that he ſets himſelf commonly to his buſineſs; and having once put himſelf into a railing vein, no wonder that it runs through all his Arguments, or rather that he leaves them very often, to refreſh himſelf with a Bout againſt the manners of his Adverſaries. Nay, I obſerve that in his long Diſcourſe concerning Holineſs, where to ſerve his Opinion, he is fain to run down the Morality of the Heathens, as if it were little or nothing worth; he ſometimes relents, and ſhews them ſome little kindneſs: but for what end, do you think? *O. Spir.* p. 324.

For nothing elſe truly, but to take an occaſion of ſhewing how much worſe we are than the Heathens themſelves, whom he cannot commend for their Virtues, but in ſpight to us, who *pretend to a life of Moral Virtues with notorious vanity*, as he is pleaſed to ſay. I have taken no pains at all to hunt for ſuch paſſages as theſe in his Book, but opened it here and there by chance; and if any man will do the like, he ſhall preſently finde enough of this ſtrain to turn his Stomach, if he be one of ordinary breeding and good manners.

O. Spir. p. 326.

P. 409,&c.

Now what ſaies Mr. *H.* to all this? Not a word I aſſure you; but he charges me with *Immorality* for *treating Dr.* Owen *with ſlighting and contempt, without any regret of Conſcience for the injuſtice and wrong of ſpeaking unworthily of the worthy.* But how great uncharitableneſs and reſpect of perſons is there in this one thing? How little did Mr. *H.* think of the *Motto* in his Title-page, *Doing nothing by Partiality?* When a man rails at all the Clergy, ſpares not a man high or low, nor ſome of the beſt of men, here are no words of it, all is well enough, though it be to the prejudice of the Souls of their Hearers. But if any man does but ſhew this mans railing

ling Temper and Diſhoneſty, though nothing be ſaid but with evidence of truth; yet ſo far is Dr. *Owen*'s Credit to be preferred before that of the whole Clergy of a great Nation; ſo far he muſt be upheld even in his wickedneſs, that all that he ſaies muſt be Sacred, even his lying and ſlandering, and no man muſt open his Lips, though every Miniſter of this Church be reproached in his common reproaches.

But ſince Mr. *H.* thinks that nothing is to be ſaid againſt the Doctor's *Railing*, I cannot wonder at his Opinion that the Doctor's *Nonſence* ought to eſcape too; for this is not ſo much to be blamed as the other. *If the Doctor* (ſaith he) *hath expreſſed any thing darkly, and I cannot make ſence of it, ſuch a paſſage as to me, is to go for nothing. That is all in civility to be ſaid of it.* In *prudence* he ſhould have ſaid, leſt by plain dealing I ſhould give that man occaſion to open his uncivil mouth once more againſt us. But if the Doctor's Fame be ſo precious and uſeful, that he muſt be uſed with more than ordinary tenderneſs, Mr. *H.* would have done the world better ſervice to have cleared thoſe *dark Paſſages*, as he calls them, from the imputation of Nonſence, than by inven- *Diſq.* p. 89.

ting ſofter Phraſes for it. But if he had attempted any ſuch thing, I doubt he would have miſcarried in it, as much as he does where he tries to bring him off from contradicting himſelf about the reaſon of believing or doubting of our Election: For Dr. *Owen* ſaies, *A man cannot believe it till it is ſeen by the effects*; and yet that *no man can juſtly doubt* of it, *or disbelieve it, till he be in ſuch a condition as wherein it is impoſſible that the effects of Election ſhould be wrought in him, if ſuch a condition there be in this World.* This I made bold to ſay was a Contradiction: Now Mr. *H.* comes to take it off. *The Doctor in one place of his Book, ſpeaking (I ſuppoſe) to a prophane perſon, yet preſuming upon his election, tells him that a man cannot believe,* &c. *In another place, ſpeaking (I ſuppoſe) to the tender ſerious Chriſtian who is yet in trouble about his Election, he ſays he cannot juſtly doubt,* &c. Well, *ſuppoſe* this were ſo; yet either that which is ſaid to the profane, or that to the tender Chriſtian, muſt neceſſarily be falſe. But had not a man that writes for or againſt any body, better take their Books and ſee what they ſay, than fall a *ſuppoſing* for them what they never thought of? Let any man look into the

Ibid.

place

place out of which I cited these paſſages, and I ſuppoſe he will finde that they lie as cloſe together in *p.* 524. as I ſaid they did, one *immediately following* the other; and that there is not the leaſt occaſion given for that pretence of Mr. *H.* that one paſſage is applied to the Profane, and the other to the Diſconſolate; nor any ground for that conſtruction which he would this way make of the words. Now if this Inſtance be to ſerve for all the reſt, as Mr. *H.* intended, the Doctor will get nothing by his ſaying, *Such are the Doctor's contradictions*; ſuch, it ſeems, as Mr. *H.* knows not how to clear him from, but by ſuppoſing things which he is afraid to examine, leſt they ſhould prove otherwiſe than as he ſuppoſes them.

I ſhall not trouble you with what he ſaies in the Doctor's behalf about the Phraſe of *Giving the Spirit*; which he P. 96. conſiders in the next place, becauſe he confeſſes that *he does not know whether the errour be in the Doctor, or in me, or in himſelf*; and therefore he ſhould have tarried till he had conſidered the thing better. But I cannot paſs over his attempt to juſtifie the Doctor in that famous paſſage which I produced againſt him out of his own Book, *p.* 181. and

recited in mine, *p.* 127. In the first place he gives this mincing account of it: *The Doctor belike hath said, that though a man should reform his Life, and be changed from Vice to Vertue, and that by hearing the Word preached;* (*this is the most I count he says, and which may be exemplified in* Herod, *who heard* John, *and did many things*) *yet if there be not an habitual righteousness infused, it signifies nothing to Regeneration. To this purpose it is onely, and altogether, the Doctor speaks. Hereupon this Gentleman breaks out, and challenges him for contradicting that Scripture: He that doth righteousness is born of God.* The Gentleman indeed did so, and he thinks he has great Reason to *break* out and *challenge* Mr. *H.* of some disingenuity for pretending that this is all I challenged the Doctor for. What he has made him to say, ought to be interpreted very favourably, to pass without a censure. But the Doctors saying was this: "Regeneration doth not "consist in a moral Reformation of life "and conversation; let us suppose such "a Reformation to be extended to *all* "*known Instances.* Suppose a man be "changed from Sensuality unto Tempe-"rance; from Rapine to Righteousness; "from Pride and the Dominion of irre-"gular Passions, unto Humility and Mo-"dera-

Disq. p. 93.

" deration; with *ALL inſtances of the* " *like nature which we can imagine*, or " are preſcribed in the rules of the ſtricteſt " Moraliſts; ſuppoſe this change be labou- " red, exact, & accurate, and ſo of great uſe " in the world; ſuppoſe alſo that a man " hath been brought and perſwaded to it " *through the preaching of the Goſpel, ſo eſ-* " *caping the pollutions that are in the world* " *through Luſt, even by the knowledge of our* " *Lord and Saviour* Jeſus Chriſt, or the " directions of his Doctrine delivered in " the Goſpel; yet, I ſay, all this, and all " this added unto *Baptiſm*, accompanied " with a profeſſion of *Faith* and *Repen-* " *tance*, is not Regeneration, nor do they " compriſe it in them. This was the Doctors ſaying; and a moſt falſe and wicked ſaying it is, as I proved in its proper place; though Mr. *H.* has ſerv'd me here, as he has done through all his Animadverſions, ſtill oppoſing my Concluſions, and never anſwering the force of any one Argument which I produced. I ſay it again, the Doctrine is *moſt falſe and wicked*; and the man might as well have ſaid in plain Terms, that a Chriſtians believing and obeying the Goſpel of *Chriſt*, does not make him Regenerate unleſs he goes to a Conventicle. But *he that juſtifieth the wicked, and he that condemneth the righteous,*

are

are both an Abomination to the Lord. The Doctor has done the latter, he has *condemned the Righteous:* I desire Mr. *H.* to beware of the former; it is some misprision of it to *justifie* the Doctor in so *wicked* a saying. For he endeavours to justifie him, by pretending the case of that man whom Dr. *Owen* reprobates in the former passage, to be like that of *Herod*, who *did many things*, though he lived in the sin of having his Brothers Wife, and was a very bad man besides: Or that of *Socrates* and other virtuous Heathens, and *Almanzor* the generous Mahometan; concerning all which, you must observe, that they were *Baptized*, and *escaped the pollutions of the World by the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ:* Or lastly, that of *Hypocrites*, and men that *do many things civilly and morally good through the power of Nature, Education, for company sake, for glory; and this* although *the man* whom the Doctor rejects, be *changed from all Vice to Temperance, Righteousness, Humility, with all instances of the like nature which we can imagine, and has been brought and perswaded to it through the preaching of the Gospel.*

And now can Mr. *H.* think he did well to say that *the Gentleman has no where exposed himself so much in his Book as here,*

here, where he endeavours to expoſe the Doctor? This I might more juſtly ſay of him, becauſe this ſlip was not through mere careleſneſs; for he confeſſes, *a perſon of Quality turned him to the place, as if the Doctor was much to be blamed*; and this could not but oblige him to conſider it: But becauſe he ſaies withal, that *he was moved at this*, I think the beſt excuſe that can be offered for him is this; That an honeſt man may be put into ſuch a heat for his Friend, that he may for ſome time forget his duty, and not do like himſelf: And all that know Mr. *H.* will make no worſe conſtruction of it than this comes to.

It was from the ſame reaſon, I ſuppoſe, *that I am accuſed of wyre-drawing the Doctors words into odious conſtructions*; of which he has given this inſtance to judge of the reſt by. I had ſaid in the Preface, that a certain paſſage in another Book of Dr. *Owens ſeemed to imply that all men are in a ſtate of damnation, who rely upon the honeſty and wiſdom of their ſpiritual Guides in matters of Faith*; which I made bold to queſtion. But this muſt be an *odious conſtruction* of the Doctors Words; which, as Mr. *H.* ſaies, were no other, than that theſe men *were in a miſerable condition.* Now if this

Diſq. p. 2, 3.

were

were true, yet even these words do *seem to imply* what I said: But if you will go to the place it self where I cited the words, you will finde that Dr. *Owen* saies concerning these implicite Believers, that *that they have indeed no Faith at all, but a wavering Opinion built upon a rotten Foundation.* Now I will venture to say, that these words do more than *seem to imply* that such men are in a damnable condition, though I was content to say no more; and therefore made a more favourable Construction of that rash saying than it deserved. Besides, if it were worth a mans while to trouble himself any farther in this matter, he might see that I endeavoured to mollifie those hard words of his, as much as I could, by saying that possibly he meant no more than that all Christians should *prove all things* as they were able; though his meaning was not cautiously expresst. So little reason had Mr. *H.* to talk upon this occasion of *redeeming the Doctor from abuses.* I had proved from Dr. *Owen*'s own words, that his Followers ought not to take Principles from him upon Trust; and this is one reason why Mr. *H.* complains here that I wanted *respect* and *modesty*; as if it were such a presumption to suppose that of the Doctor which

which he believes of every body elſe, that he may be miſtaken. But *if I may take my Conjecture*, as he ſpeaks, from this finding fault where no juſt cauſe was given, what his main quarrel is; 'tis no other than this, that one who has not *ſtudied Divinity* above *Ten years*, ſhould contend about *theſe things* with the Doctor who has ſtudied them *Forty*. Now although this were true, yet it ſhould not have troubled him, becauſe 'tis then Four to One againſt me; which might have been ſaid as gravely as the other. But though Dr. *Owen* has had *Forty* years for the ſtudy of Divinity, it may yet be doubted whether he has ſtudied Divinity all the while; and that not without good reaſon, ſince ſome of his time has been ſpent in *Commonwealth*-affairs, and ſpurring on the *Good Old Cauſe*, which is no very good help to the ſtudy of Divinity. But to let that paſs, I think it implies more want of *reſpect* and *modeſty* in Dr. *Owen* to treat the Biſhops and Clergy of this Church ſo unmannerly as he has done, than in a younger man to diſpute a point of Divinity with him alone, and to tax his rudeneſs by the way. *Diſq.* p. 2.

This is all I ſhall ſay to Mr. *H.*'s Reflections upon the Author, which I confeſs he

he has tempered with so many civilities by the way, that upon the whole matter I must confess him to be an Ingenuous Adversary: But sometimes an Accusation is more readily believed, when a man praises the person whom he blames; and therefore it was more needful to say something to his rebukes, which I deserved as little as I do his Commendations.

And now I come to Mr. *H.*'s Animadversions upon the *Conclusions* of the Book: for, as I hinted before, he has let the *Arguments* alone. I shall begin with his *Animadversions* upon the Introduction.

The principal designe of the Introduction was to shew the meaning of the *Natural* and *Spiritual* man, 1 *Cor.* 2. 14, 15. Now besides Dr. *Owen*'s Interpretation
Disq. p. 5, 9. and mine, Mr. *H.* propounded two others, which he seems to reject at last; and I think he had more reason to reject than to offer them. I shall therefore consider what he has said of the two former onely. And first of Dr. *Owen*'s, *whose*
P. 7. *interpretation*, he saies, *is generally received by our Divines, so little reason hath any man to make any assault upon him in this matter:* And he makes his Opinion to be this; That the Natural man is the

Unrege-

Unregenerate or Carnal Profeſſor, who receives the Doctrines of the Goſpel, but *not ſo as to apply them, and lead his life according to them.* To which I Anſwer 1. That this interpretation is *not* generally received by our Divines; and that may be as good as your ſaying that it is. 2. That if it were, their Authority makes nothing for Dr. *Owen*, who has given us another interpretation of the place. I had made it plain, with what Artifice he would perſwade his Readers, that to underſtand the Myſteries of the Goſpel *Spiritually*, was to underſtand them as he does; and that he had forced this Text all along to favour that deſigne, including every one that believes the Goſpel, but can ſee no reaſon to believe thoſe his darling Opinions, which he calls *Myſteries*, under the *Natural* man. Now if Mr. *H.* can bring him off, by pretending onely, without offering to prove it, that he means a *practical* and *experimental* knowledge, when he ſpeaks of our inability to know his pretended Myſteries without his New Light: Dr. *Owen* may ſay what he will, and ſhall never want a friend to make it out. And I am ſure it will be to no purpoſe for me to produce his ſayings any more, if after I had fully repreſented his opinion in his own words,

words, and distinctly shewn the weaknesses of it, Mr. *H.* can set all right again, by saying that his Opinion *is commonly received, however elaborately he hath improved it.*

But neither do I think the common interpretation (as he calls it) to be the true meaning of the place, *viz.* that the Text speaks of the *Unregenerate man's inability to receive the Doctrines of the Gospel, so as to apply them and live according to them, without supernatural Assistance.* That which he saies for it comes to no more than this, that the *Doctrine it self is a truth never to be gainsaid by this man.* But that this Truth is the sence of that place, I am likely to gainsay, till I know your reasons for it. In the mean time there are these amongst many others against it.

1. This Interpretation takes away the coherence of the Text with the precedent Discourse, beginning at the 18 *v.* of the 1 *Cap.* I had largely shewn that St. *Paul's* designe was to justifie the Christian Faith, as being founded upon Testimonies of divine Revelation, against the unbelieving *Greeks* and *Jews*, especially the former: And that this designe was carried on to the end of the second Chapter: And by all this, that the

the *Natural* man to whom the *things of God are fooliſhneſs*, was the ſame with the *Greek* or *Gentile* of whom the Apoſtle had expreſly ſaid, *v.* 23. *Chap.* 1. that the preaching of *Chriſt crucified was fooliſhneſs to him.* For otherwiſe there is no rational coherence of the Text with the former part of the Diſcourſe. In particular, by making the Natural man to be one that believes the Goſpel, but lives not according to it, we muſt ſuppoſe the Apoſtle to ſtart a new ſubject of Diſcourſe, when by all circumſtances it appears that he is purſuing the old.

2. If this Interpretation be right, then by the *things of the Spirit of God*, Mr. *H.* muſt underſtand the moral Precepts as well as the Myſteries of Chriſtianity: nay the former rather than the latter; becauſe the carnal Profeſſor is not ſo much offended with the latter as with the former. They are the rules and precepts of the Goſpel *chiefly* which he *cannot receive ſo as to apply them and live according to them.* Whilſt he is a *Chriſtian* as acknowledging the *Myſteries*, he is *carnal* as violating the *Precepts* of *Chriſt.* But that part of Chriſtianity, from which he is moſt averſe, muſt in reaſon be chiefly intended by thoſe *things*

of God, that he cannot receive; if the carnal Professor be spoken of. But Mr.
P. 10. *H.* confesseth that the *things of the Spirit of God*, and the *deep things of God*, which the Natural man receiveth not, are *the Arbitrary Counsels of Gods will, for the saving of man by his Grace in and through Jesus Christ, which lie not within the Scheme of Nature, and come not therefore within the ken of humane Understanding, unless they be made known to us either by Inspiration of them into our selves, or by the Revelation of them through the Spirit by others.* If this be true, then Mr. *H.*'s *Divines*, that include the carnal Professor under the Natural man, are plainly mistaken: For these things of God are not *foolishness* to him that believes them, as the *carnal* man *may*, and very *often doth.*

3. St. *Paul* speaking in justification of the *Spiritual* mans wisdome, pleads thus in his behalf against the Natural man: *For who hath known the minde of the Lord, that he should instruct him? but we have the minde of Christ:* Which is plain and direct reasoning against the *Greek*, who rejects the Revelation of *Christ*, and thereby the *things of the Spirit of God*; but not against the disobedient Believer, who does not pretend to instruct

inſtruct God, or to determine concerning the *deep things of God*, otherwiſe than as he himſelf is inſtructed by the Revelation of God. Therefore I think, unleſs you will make the Apoſtles reaſon to be impertinent, you are by the Natural man to underſtand the former, not the latter.

This is all I ſhall need to ſay againſt that which Mr. *H.* makes bold to call the common interpretation. I come next to conſider his Objections againſt that ſence of the place which I offered out of St. *Chyſoſtome*. All that he ſaies againſt it proceeds upon this ſuppoſition, that if this be the true ſence, then he who admits the Scriptures as the Word of God, and does thereupon believe the Doctrine of Salvation by *Jeſus Chriſt*, is a *Spiritual* man, according to the uſe of the Word in this place. This indeed follows from what I ſaid; and hereupon Mr. *H.* argues in this manner.

1. *Becauſe the Spiritual man*, v. 15. *is the ſame with him that hath received the Spirit*, v. 12. *therefore the Spiritual man muſt not be one that hath received the Scriptures onely. For the Revelation of the Scriptures without us to judge of things by, and the Spirit of God within, either inſpiring theſe things, or operating on the*

minde to understand them, are two things. To this I answer, 1. That the Operation of the Spirit in order to the understanding of the Scriptures, is not excluded by affirming him to be a Spiritual man in the Apostle's sence, who by the Scriptures knows the mysteries of the Gospel, and believes them. 2. *Receiving the Spirit* is a Phrase which indifferently signifies receiving the Revelations of the Spirit, whether by an immediate *Inspiration*, as the Apostles received them; or upon the *Testimony* of inspired persons, either *Oral* or *Written*, as they have been received by those who were not inspired themselves. Although therefore to *receive the Spirit*, and *to be Spiritual*, were all one, yet it follows not that he who is instructed out of the *Scriptures onely*, is not spiritual: All that follows is, that he is not *the onely spiritual man*, because the *inspired*, and those that *heard* and *believed* them, were so too. But I grant that *receiving the Spirit which is of God*, in *v.* 12. is by the Context restrained to the first sence, *viz.* of being *inspired*; because it is there affirmed of the Apostles, or those who being themselves inspired, taught others, and proved their Doctrine by the Demonstration of the Spirit and of Power. But then 3. The *Spiritual man*,

man, v. 15. is not the ſame with him that hath *received the Spirit of God*, v. 12. For he is ſpiritual who *receiveth the things of the Spirit of God*, v. 14. *i. e.* who believeth the myſteries of the Goſpel, which he may do upon the teſtimony of the Apoſtles, without ſuch Inſpiration as they themſelves had. Whereas therefore Mr. *H.* ſays, *It is apparent that the ſpiritual man in the one verſe, and he that received the Spirit in the other muſt be one*; I anſwer, it is apparent that they are *not* one: for to receive *the Spirit*, as that ſignifies, *v.* 12. to be Inſpired, is one thing; and to receive *the things of the Spirit* (which he that doth is not the Natural, but the Spiritual man) is another; the latter being implied in the former, not the former in the latter. And ſo much for his firſt Argument.

The ſecond is this: *The ſpiritual man judges all things*; but all they who receive the Scriptures, do not judge all things; for the *Socinians* do not judge or diſcern all things; for they diſcern not the myſtery of *God* manifeſted in the Fleſh: Therefore ſome that *receive the Scriptures are not ſpiritual.* This is the ſum of his Argument, to which I anſwer; That judging all things does not imply

Infallibility, nor does it ſignifie *not being deceived in any thing*. The Natural man is one to whom the Goſpel is fooliſhneſs; but it was not fooliſhneſs to the *Corinthian*-Converts; therefore they were ſpiritual, and yet divers of them were deceived in ſome points. Beſides, if the words are to be underſtood as the Objection ſuppoſeth, then it lies equally againſt ſaying that the Regenerate man is the Spiritual man, unleſs every good Chriſtian were free from all miſtakes in Religion: But Mr. *H.*'s buſineſs was to make Objections, no matter what, not caring though they return upon himſelf. I ſuppoſe he intended onely to ſet me a taſk; and for this once I am content to ſubmit to it. But *my Maſter* has not done very fairly, to form an Argument out of this verſe againſt our notion of the Spiritual man, without taking the leaſt notice of that interpretation of the verſe, which I offered, and which being ſuppoſed, there is no place for the Objection.

While Mr. *H.* had the Introduction before him, he might have anſwered his own Objection two ways: 1. Suppoſing that by *all things* are meant all Goſpel-myſteries, then by *judging* we need not mean a right underſtanding of every one

one of them in particular; but being ſatisfied that they are all true, both thoſe that we do, and thoſe . t we do not underſtand, becauſe we know them to be witneſſed by the Spirit: Or (as in the Introduction) the Spiritual man *is able to prove their Truth, by proving that they are divinely revealed*; and this he may do againſt the Natural man, (who diſputeth not the meaning, but the truth of theſe things) though he be miſtaken in the ſence of one or more divine Revelations; which is not the caſe of the *Socinians* onely. 2. If by *all things* we underſtand, with St. *Chryſoſtome*, both Natural and Supernatural Truths, then the meaning ſeems to be, that the Spiritual man is *well qualified* to judge of both. For we are ſometimes ſaid to do that indefinitely, which we enjoy the means, and are actually furniſhed with ability to do. Now the Spiritual man is rightly qualified to judge of Truths in either kinde, becauſe he hath the Principles of Reaſon equally with the Natural man; and has received farther knowledge by particular *Revelation*, which the other hath not; and this may be well ſaid without ſuppoſing him free from all miſtake, whether in natural or revealed Religion.

It often happens that a Sentence where the phraſe *all things* is uſed, muſt be interpreted moderately, as when 'tis ſaid that *Charity believeth all things*, &c. And ſuch an ἐπείκεια is to be uſed in the interpretation of this place: *The ſpiritual man judgeth all things.*

Whereas therefore Mr. *H.* proceeds, *Nay how can it be ſaid of him that he is judged of none, ſeeing as he judges all things by thoſe Scriptures, ſo is he judged of all in what he holds by the ſame?* I anſwer likewiſe, that theſe words, *He is judged of none*, are not to be taken in the rigorous ſence. In this very Epiſtle 'tis ſaid, *Let the Prophets propheſie two or three, and let the reſt judge.* I ſhew'd in the Introduction that thoſe words ſignifie the unreprovableneſs of the Spiritual man in aſſenting to the myſteries of the Goſpel.

The 3d Argument is ſo often repeated, that Mr. *H.* ſeems to lay a great ſtreſs upon it. In ſhort, it is this, that I have offered ſuch a ſence of the *Spiritual* man, as is inconſiſtent with what I had affirmed concerning the *Demonſtration of the Spirit and of Power*, v. 4. For if that demonſtration were miraculous, then the Spiritual man muſt be one that was extraordinarily inſpired, and could prove

it

it by Miracles; and if the Spiritual man be any one that believes the Revelations of the Goſpel, then that demonſtration was not by Miracles and ſupernatural Gifts. Now it ſeems M. *H.* is not inclinable to think that the demonſtration which St. *Paul* meant was miraculous; and towards the end of his *firſt Chapter* he propounds ſome reaſons againſt it to the Author of the *Friendly Debate*; not only for the ſake of Dr. *Owen*'s interpretation of the fourteenth and fifteenth Verſes, but, I thank him, for mine alſo: For having ſet me ſo hard a taſk, good nature began to work, and for the young mans encouragement he reſolved to take ſome part of it upon himſelf; but, as it falls out, he was miſtaken in thinking to do me a courteſie this way: For in the firſt place, I ſhall undo it, if I can, by ſhewing that he has offered no good reaſon againſt that Author's opinion: And then I ſhall ſhew that his Expoſition of that place (concerning the *Demonſtration*, &c.) being allowed, my notion of the *Spiritual man* is not at all prejudiced by it.

Againſt his ſence of *the demonſtration*, &c. Mr. *H.* offers theſe things: 1. *That he ſees not any thing that will reſtrain his ſence on neceſſity to that meaning.* And becauſe

becauſe he ſees it not, therefore no body elſe does. But how much *neceſſity* does he mean? If he will look into the Firſt and Third Parts of the Friendly Debate, he may there ſee a great deal offered from reaſon and Scripture, and other good Authorities, for that meaning. And till he has ſhewn that thoſe *Reaſons are not cogent*, his ſaying that he ſees nothing in them to compel him, will hardly compel other men. 2. *The Demonſtration of the Spirit and of Power, he ſays is oppoſed to the excellency of Speech, or enticing words of mans wiſdom. But the Apoſtles ſpeaking with Tongues, or his miraculous Gifts, do not oppoſe the Eloquence of man or excellency of words, but rather agrees with it.* What he means by *oppoſing* and *agreeing*, is again hard to ſay. I confeſs they do not oppoſe one another as *Fire* and *water* do, but they are things *diſparate*, as he cannot deny. And things that are but diſtinct from one another, are then lawfully enough *oppoſed*, when one is ſaid to be choſen, and another refuſed. If therefore it be good ſence, that the Apoſtle came not with Philoſophical Arguments, or Eloquent Speeches, but with Miracles and Supernatural Gifts, to convince men that the *Crucified Jeſus* was the Chriſt; what need you deſire a better

ter oppoſition? But Mr. *H.* addes; *That which does in the moſt direct ſence oppoſe the excellency of Speech, and enticing words of mans wiſdom, is plain Truth which the Spirit teacheth.* I ſuppoſe he means *plainneſs in declaring* that truth which the Spirit teaches. Now theſe things are indeed oppoſite too. But it does not from thence follow, that the later is the Demonſtration of the Spirit: For that muſt not be *any thing* that is oppoſed to excellency of Speech, but what the Apoſtle meant to oppoſe to it. But that *plain ſpeaking* of the truth which the Spirit teacheth, is not the demonſtration of the Spirit, is from hence evident, that it is no Demonſtration at all, no more than *excellency of Speech* it ſelf. For when a man onely affirms the Truth of a Propoſition, whether he affirms it *nakedly* and *plainly*, or with ornament and flouriſh, he does neither way prove it to be true merely in affirming it. Now Mr. *H.* may obſerve, that the *plain Truth*, which the Spirit taught, and which the Apoſtle ſpeaks of in this place, is, that *Jeſus* who was *crucified* is *the Chriſt.* But this was that which the Gentiles were to be convinced of; and the oppoſition between the Demonſtration of the Spirit and of

power

power on the one ſide, and the words of mans wiſdom (that wiſdom or Philoſophy which the Greeks ſought after) on the other, is an oppoſition between two waies or methods to convince, the one whereof St. *Paul* uſed, the other he neglected; that of Philoſophical wiſdom he neglected, that of the Demonſtration of the Spirit he uſed. And that Miracles and Supernatural Gifts are ſuch a demonſtration, Mr. *H.* cannot deny. Wherefore theſe are more properly oppoſed in this place to Philoſophical Argumentation, than the truth it ſelf which the Apoſtle was to prove one way or other. Now as Miracles and ſupernatural Teſtimonies, rendered the words of mans wiſdom unneceſſary to convince; ſo they rendered excellency of Speech unneceſſary to perſwade. The Apoſtles needed onely to ſpeak that truth nakedly and plainly, which the Spirit had taught them, becauſe they confirmed it by the demonſtration of the Spirit.

3. His next Argument is not very clearly expreſt; but the ſum of it I think is this. *Becauſe in ſome other part of the Chapter, the Apoſtle mentions an Advantage common to the whole Church: therefore the priviledge of ſpeaking in the Demonſtration of the Spirit,* &c. *is common to*

to the whole Church, Therefore that Demonſtration was not by Miracles,&c. Now I grant that he ſpeaks of ſomething common to all the Faithful elſewhere in this Chap. (though I do not think Mr. *H.* has given a good inſtance in *v.* 12.) but that therefore nothing is mentioned in the Chap. which was proper to the firſt age of the Church, has not the leaſt appearance of a good conſequence, as you will ſee, when I come to ſhew the conſiſtency of allowing him who, in any age, believes the Scriptures, to be a Spiritual man, with affirming the demonſtration of the Spirit to be proper onely to the Age of Miracles.

4. His fourth Argument begins with this Propoſition: *Thoſe things the Holy Ghoſt teaches a man by comparing one thing with another, as Spiritual things with Spiritual, which is by way of ſtudy and diſcurſive reaſon, are not demonſtrated in a way miraculous and extraordinary belonging only to the Appoſtles, and not other Miniſters of Chriſt.* If Mr. *H.* means that to diſcourſe from Scripture, is not to demonſtrate by doing Miracles, this is plain and true enough: But yet the ſame Doctrine might be argued the former way, and demonſtrated the later, and that by the ſame per-

perſons, the Apoſtles. But ſaies Mr. *H. ſuch was the Apoſtles ſpeaking here.* This is very obſcure. He ſhould have proceeded thus: *But thoſe things which the Apoſtles ſpake, were taught them by the Holy Ghoſt in the way of ſtudy and diſcurſive reaſon:* And then he had made out a very fair concluſion, that, Therefore they were not demonſtrated by miracle. But by his adding the 13th *v.* of this Chap. *Which things alſo we ſpeak not in the words which mans wiſdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghoſt teacheth, comparing Spiritual things with Spiritual:* I perceive he intended this Argument. If the meaning of the 4th and 13th *v.* be the ſame, then the demonſtration by Miracles is not meant in the 4th *v.* becauſe it is not meant in the 13th. To this I might anſwer, 1. By denying the ſuppoſition, *viz.* that the meaning of the verſes is the ſame. For, notwithſtanding all that he pretends to the contrary, *Comparing Spiritual things with Spiritual*, or one Scripture with another, might be propounded for that end, of underſtanding the ſence; as the Demonſtration of the Spirit, was for that of proving the truth of Goſpel-Myſteries. All the reaſon, after a multitude of words, which he offers againſt it is this, that *where the Revelation*

P. 13.

is

is Divine, the truth and meaning are one another; and he that rightly understands the meaning, has the truth by that understanding, if he judges by the Scriptures. To which I reply, that the reason why he believes the Revelation to be Divine, and consequently true, is one thing; and the way whereby he may come to understand the true meaning of some part of that Revelation, is another: the former is the testimony of Revelation which is given to the whole; the later, comparing one part of it with another. But because I would not wear out the Reader upon this subject, I shall take no farther notice of what you say against my thoughts of this place, but let you enjoy the pleasure of your own; *viz.* that to *demonstrate by the Spirit*, and to *prove by comparing Spiritual things with* Spiritual, are the same thing. But then you gain nothing by it. For 2. From this supposition it follows not, that that Demonstration was not Miraculous; for that phrase πνευματικοῖς πνευματικὰ συγκρίνοντες, may very well bear this version, *viz. adapting* or *suiting Spiritual things to Spiritual:* i. e. Spiritual *Arguments* or Demonstrations, to Spiritual *Doctrines* or Truths. And then this phrase doth but more generally express what kind of Arguments, the Apostles

poſtles proved their Doctrines by, *viz.* ſuch Arguments as muſt needs be judged proper to the Nature of thoſe Doctrines; for theſe being Spiritual, *i. e.* taught by the Revelation of the Spirit, it was fit that thoſe ſhould be Spiritual too, *i.e.* the Demonſtration of the Spirit and of Power. And then I leave Mr. *H.* to conſider, whether it can be ſhewn from this 13th *v.* that this Demonſtration was not by Miracles. This Anſwer I do not uſe merely to avoid Mr. *H*'s Objection, for I think it proceeds upon a more probable ſence of the place, than that of comparing Scripture with Scripture. For his conjecture that the 4th and 13th verſes mean the ſame thing, I thank him; and in requital thereof, I ſhall return this reaſon for it, which aroſe to my thoughts, preſently upon conſidering his opinion. Becauſe the Apoſtle in both verſes does plainly reject the ſame thing, *viz.* the *words of mans wiſdom*, it is probable that what he alſo approves in both is the *ſame*: And therefore that the Demonſtration of the Spirit is underſtood by the [πνευματικῷ] *Spiritual* Arguments, v. 13. which the Apoſtles did [συγκρίνειν] judge moſt commodious and proper [πνευματικοῖς] for the Revelations of the Spirit to be proved by.

5. He

5. He ſays that *the Compariſon between the Natural and Spiritual man, ſeems more aptly to be underſtood of the Regenerate and Unregenerate, than of the extraordinarily Inſpired only, unto which this moſt curious Interpreters thoughts muſt lead him.* To which I Anſwer, That it does not ſeem to be aptly underſtood, either of the one or the other, but onely of thoſe that do, and thoſe that do not admit the Revelations of the Goſpel: and whereas you ſay, *That Interpreters thoughts muſt lead him* to underſtand the *extraordinary inſpired onely*, by the Spiritual man; I ſhall preſently ſhew that there is not the leaſt reaſon for it.

6. Mr. *H.* offers his own Interpretation, which in effect we have had already, *viz.* That to ſpeak in the Demonſtration of the Spirit, is to *deliver the very truth of Scripture in oppoſition to humane Conceit*, &c. To which I reply, That the Doctrine which the Apoſtle delivered, was the Truth to be *Demonſtrated*, and therefore was not the *Demonſtration* it ſelf, therefore not the *Demonſtration of the Spirit.*

This may ſuffice to clear the true Interpretation of the 4th *v.* from Mr. *H*'s oppoſitions. And that I have not done the leaſt diſſervice to that ſence of the

14th and 15th, which he objects alſo againſt, I ſhall now try to ſhew. It ſeems Mr. *H.* thought it ſo plain, that if the *Demonſtration*, *v.* 4. was miraculous, then the Spiritual man, *v.* 15. was the *extraordinarily inſpired*, that he never went about to prove it. But if Mr. *H.* were not a man of reputation, I would never trouble my ſelf to confute it. Becauſe the Apoſtle ſpeaks in ſome part of this Chapter of the whole Church, does it follow preſently that he does not in any other part of it, ſo much as mention any thing peculiar to the Apoſtles and to the
P. 18. § 3. Primitive Church, as Mr. *H.* argues? Or ſuppoſing that by *the demonſtration*, &c. *v.* 4. we are to underſtand Miracles, *&c.* muſt it follow that none are ſpoken of throughout the whole Chap. beſides thoſe that could do Miracles? A little proving here, would have done no harm, I think. His reaſons which he has kept to himſelf, I cannot gueſs at, and muſt therefore content my ſelf with diſproving the conſequence; which I have the leſs reaſon to be aſhamed of doing, becauſe he has gravely admoniſht me upon this occaſion, as you may ſee, *p.* 15.

Briefly then, 1. *It ſtands with good ſence, and is conſiſtent with the Apoſtles deſign*, to ſuppoſe him ſpeaking in the com-

compaſs of this Chapter, both of ſomething peculiar to the firſt ages of the Church, and ſomething common to all. For inſtance, ſuppoſing that he ſpeaks of the Demonſtration of Miracles in the 4th *v.* then the next *v.* which mentions an Advantage common to all the faithful in all ages, has clearly a good ſence very pertinent to the former. *That your Faith might not ſtand in the wiſdom of men, but in the power of God.* Is not this a good reaſon why the Faith of Chriſtians in all ages ſtands in the power of God, *viz.* becauſe the Chriſtian Doctrine was at firſt demonſtrated by the power of God in Miracles and Supernatural gifts? Then Mr. *H.* may ſee, that although Miracles are to be underſtood in the 4th *v.* yet there is a very good Connexion between that and the very next *v.* where ſomething is mentioned that belongs to all true Believers.

2. If by the Natural man, we underſtand the *Greek* or *Gentile*, that admits not the revelation of the Goſpel, and by the Spiritual man, every one that does; then *that which is affirmed of them, is clearly conſequent upon the foregoing diſcourſe*; the ſum of which is this, that he had demonſtrated the Chriſtian Doctrine by Miracles, and Supernatural Gifts; that

the Doctrine it ſelf was a Myſtery, and could be known only by Revelation, ſince it depended only on the free will of God, and therefore was not to be made out by Natural Reaſon, and could be proved only by Teſtimonies of Divine Revelation. Now from hence it clearly follows, That he who relies onely upon Natural Reaſon, and does not admit Revelation, cannot know the things of the Spirit of God, or the Myſteries of the Goſpel: For they are not to be found out by Natural Reaſon, by which alone he guides himſelf; they cannot be made known but through particular Revelation, which he rejects: And they are fooliſhneſs to him, becauſe he ſeeks for Philoſophical wiſdom. The concluſion concerning the Spiritual man, ſuppoſing him to be one that admits the Revelation of the Goſpel, follows with like clearneſs. In a word, the Apoſtle does not defend *himſelf* onely, for having confirmed the Goſpel by Teſtimonies of Divine Revelation, but *thoſe* likewiſe who did or ſhould believe thereupon: And his diſcourſe is not directed againſt thoſe that were not extraordinarily inſpired, and could not ſpeak in the Demonſtration of, *&c.* but againſt thoſe that would not believe the Teſtimony of the Inſpired, nor be

be convinced by ſuch Demonſtration. *If* this does not ſatisfie Mr. *H.* of the conſiſtency of thoſe Interpretations he would ſet at odds, I ſhall be ſorry that I troubled the Reader at all about it. So much for the Introduction.

The four firſt *Chapters*, which contain the greateſt part of the Book, he cleared his hands of with expedition enough; but he might as well have let them quite alone, for his Animadverſions are not very material. I had ſaid, That the word *Spirit* ſometimes ſignifies the Temper of the mind, and he blames me for not ſaying whether that temper be of *Nature* or of *Grace*; that is, becauſe I was not ſo impertinent as to ſhew the *cauſe* of a thing, where I had nothing to do, but to ſhew how it is ſometimes called. Preſently after he is *put in mind how lank this Author is in ſpeaking to common Heads*, &c. and that becauſe I noted but four ſignifications of the word *Spirit*, whereas he ſaies there are *more than four*. But why he troubled himſelf to ſay ſo, I know not; for the Author had ſaid it enough before, having told him, *p.* 61. That *there were other ſignifications of the word* Spirit, *wch he mentioned not*, becauſe they were ſomewhat *forreign* to his ſubject. Theſe miſtakes look as if Mr. *H.* took a

nap ſometimes, and then came in at the wrong place. Thus I am reproved for excepting at the Doctor, merely for *alluding in his words to ſome Texts that ſpeak of miraculous gifts, and ſo cannot be applied to us.* Now if a man will but look into the place, from *p.* 64. to *p.* 69. he will ſee that I found fault with the Doctor for miſapplying thoſe Texts, as he does, by *arguing* from them, as if they ſpake of the conſtant Operations of the Spirit; and this is ſomething more then Alluding to them. But I hope Mr. *H.* does not expect an Anſwer to all his Animadverſions of this ſort, which to ſay no worſe, are palpable miſtakes. What elſe can any man make of his pretending, that the Doctor meant no more by ſaying that Regeneration is a *proper Term*, than that it is a *proper Metaphor?* For if he had not winked a good while together, he muſt needs have taken notice, that I produced divers paſſages of his, in ſome of which he pretends to *prove* the proper ſence of the word, and in others to *diſprove* the *Metaphorical.* That the Metaphor is proper, I ſhewed largely in the Chap. of Regeneration; but the Dr. has not one line to that purpoſe in all his Book, but a great deal to ſhew that it is no Metaphor at all, as it is uſed in the Scrip-

Scripture. And ſo I leave it to Mr. *H*'s ſecond thoughts, whether I had not reaſon to confute the Dr. upon that point, or if he had any to pretend, that the Dr. was concerned onely for the *propriety*, or rather the fitneſs of the Metaphor.

As for the faults he has found in my Method, and particularly in making *two Chapters* concerning the Graces of the H. Spirit; whereas *the Dr. or another perhaps would have marſhalled theſe things otherwiſe*, and all the other little diſparagements of this kind, which he has contrived againſt me, I have nothing to ſay, but that I gave ſuch reaſons as I had, for the method and way in which I diſcourſed upon this Subject; but I was never ſo vain as to expect that they would ſatisfie every body. But whereas he took pains to repeat the Graces of the H. Spirit, as I had methodized them, and this for nothing elſe, but to tell the Reader, That *here I have nothing againſt the Dr. nor the Dr. againſt me, but a good Sermon he ſuppoſes we have, which I may have preached ſomewhere*, &c. I was not a little ſurprized at that. Elſewhere he is angry with me for being *ſo much upon the Dr.* But I wonder moſt at the laſt fling; That ſo grave a man as Mr. *H.* ſhould diſcountenance a young Writer, for ha-

ving Printed in a Treatise, what was by his own Confession a good Sermon. And yet he is so in love with the Observation, that he ends this Chapter with telling us, *Here we have another excellent Sermon thrust in.* For my part, I take it to be a good civil ingenious Abuse, and there is more kindness in it than I deserve. But what they will think of it, who make *Good preaching*, not at all inferiour to *speaking in the Demonstration of the Spirit and of power*, Mr. *H.* has some reason to doubt; especially because he is of the same mind himself.

But the *Sermons* themselves (as he calls them) are not so good neither as to escape his censure: For in one of them he
P. 27. has found such *reasoning, as before a year is gone over my head, may give me occasion to believe, that some things may seem strong in a Sermon, that are not fit for a Book.* Thus much I *believed* long ago; but I gave him no occasion to put me in mind of it now. From the application of the two Parables, *Luke* 11. 5, 11. I concluded that the H. Spirit was promised for needful purposes *only.* Now saies he, *This indeed may be argued from the Parables in the Context, that the Gift it self of the Spirit is a thing needful.* May it so indeed? then *before a year is gone over*

his

his head, he may believe it lawful to argue farther. Therefore the H. Spirit is promiſed to produce ſuch Effects only as are needful, and that for this plain reaſon; Becauſe the Gift of the H. Spirit cannot be ſaid to be needful (with reſpect to our Salvation) for the producing of an effect which is not ſo. But that which I am moſt blamed for, ſeems to be, that I have not *laid down all thoſe* needful *benefits* P. 27. *which we have from the Spirit.* For inſtance; Firſt, that I have omitted *union to Chriſt, the primary effect of our having the Spirit, by means whereof all ſaving influences from the head are derived; and this by another would not have been forgotten.* But I wiſh Mr. *H.* had remembred to explain this ſaying a little, for divers things may be underſtood by it. I ſhall take it as it admits of this candid Interpretation. That when a man is become a Diſciple of *Chriſt*, by Baptiſm and real Obedience through the H. Spirit, (which is our part of union) then there follows the gracious love of God and Chriſt to him (which is the other bleſſed completion of our union, expreſſed by *Gods dwelling in us*) from whence flow all ſorts of bleſſed influences of the Spirit. But this was not forgotten by me, as I ſhall ſhew Mr. *H.* preſently. Secondly,

ly, whereas, ſaies he, *the Holy Ghoſt was promiſed and ſent to the Church as the Comforter, tis ſtrange that the Conſolations of the Spirit ſhould be left out by me.* Now the Holy Ghoſt was promiſed to the Church as the *Paraclete*, or Comforter; but not to all ages of the Church, as to the firſt; not to us, as to the Apoſtles: to us, by giving us peace and joy in believing; to them moreover, by inſpiring them with the knowledge of the Truth, by owning and pleading their cauſe in thoſe miraculous works, which he enabled them to perform, and by doing other extraordinary things for them: All which, if you mind it, is contained in his being the *Paraclete*, as you may ſatisfie your ſelf by conſulting the 14th and 16th Chapters of St. *John*. But without all queſtion, the Holy Ghoſt is promiſed as a Comforter to *us* too, that is, in order to true Spiritual *peace* and *joy*. And this is one of thoſe effects which I named in the *Chap. concerning the ſeveral Graces of the H. Spirit*. The reaſon why I mentioned it not in the Chap. where you miſs it, is, becauſe my deſign was there to ſhew in general, what kind of effects were to be expected from the H. Spirit, and ſo many in particular, as ſeemed *plainly* to *imply* the reſt, and from which they might be

be *readily deduced*, as you may find, *p.* 81. Now as *Union to Christ*, (which is one Grace you desire) is the same thing, with Faith, Love, and Obedience to him; for in these things our Union to him consisteth, which Union is compleated by his Love to us, from whence those blessed effects flow, that were hinted before: so Spiritual Peace and Joy, is consequent upon sound knowledge, and the Testimony of a good Conscience; and I suppose Mr. *H.* does not mean by the Consolations of the Spirit, any other joys, than what are grounded upon principles of Truth, and upon Obedience in Heart and Life. And then he might easily have deduced these two benefits of the H. Spirit, which were not named in the second Chap. from those that are, and so have saved himself and me, the trouble of these needless Exceptions.

As to what he saies concerning the necessity of the Spirits *Guidance*, he means either the Spirits *Internal Guidance of our thoughts*, by his motions upon our hearts, and this is but another word for his Operations upon our understandings and wills, in order to our Salvation; or else he means, his *Guidance of things without us* in order to our good; and some of his expressions plainly shew that

to

to be part of his meaning. But the providence of God in diſpoſing thoſe occurrences of Life, wherein we are concerned, to our Spiritual good, is a ſubject I was not directly concerned to engage in. And ſo much for his Animadverſions upon the four firſt Chapters.

I proceeded next to conſider thoſe Attainments which ſome men either unreaſonably pretend to have received, or expect to receive from the H. Spirit. The firſt whereof was that of coming to the ſence of Scripture by an Immediate Revelation, or Interpreting Scripture by
P. 29. an Infallible Spirit: which *wonderful gift, no body, that Mr.* H. *knows, pretends to in our days:* As if he had never known that there are *Papiſts*, and other *Fanaticks* and *Enthuſiaſts* that pretend to the gift of Infallible Interpretation as confidently as they. How far I charged Dr. *O.* with this pretence, any man may ſee, *p.* 112, 214. and elſewhere. But Mr. *H.* inſtead of taking any notice of it, blinds the matter with pretending, That *I cannot charge any thing of this kind upon Dr.* O. So that my *Arguments may be ſpared*, as he tells me. And I think his Animadverſions upon one of them might have been ſpared too. I had ſaid that coming

coming to the true ſence of a difficult place by enquiry and ſtudy, would in all probability be more uſeful to *others* at leaſt, than gaining it by an Immediate Revelation; and that becauſe we might lead others into the knowledge we had gained the former way, whereas we could not convince them that we were Inſpired, but by Miracles. Now after this reaſon was offered, Mr. *H.* comes and ſaies, that the uſefulneſs of the former way above the later, *is as certainly falſe, as that Gold is not ſo good as Braſs.* Now if I ſhould bring twenty Arguments more to prove what I ſaid, Gold would ſtill be better than Braſs; and ſo long, he would be in as good a condition to deny the concluſion as he was at firſt.

The ſecond pretended gift was Abſolute aſſurance of Salvation in the Event. All that Mr. *H.* ſays againſt me upon this Head, proceeds upon an unjuſt charge, That I confounded this with Aſſurance of being in a ſtate of Grace; whereas the contrary is moſt evident, *viz.* That I did not confound them, but very carefully and more than once diſtinguiſh them, as you may ſee, *p.* 190. *&* *p.* 197. I ſhall not repeat the words, but I am ſure he cannot produce any one ſingle paſſage, which could give him the leaſt reaſo-

reaſonable cauſe *to doubt what indeed my mind is* concerning aſſurance of our preſent good eſtate. But nothing is plain to a man, when he deſires not to underſtand.

The third pretence was that of uttering the ſuggeſtions of the Spirit, in Extemporary prayers. What I ſaid to prove the vanity of this pretence, he meddles not with; but all his endeavour is to ſhew, That I have not deprived him of an Argument for it, by that Interpretation which I offered of *Rom.* 8. 26, 27. *Likewiſe the Spirit helpeth our Infirmities*, &c. The ſum of it was this; That whereas we know not whether deliverance from the afflictions of this life would be good or bad for us; the Spirit diſpoſeth our minds to contentment, and earneſt deſires of what is beſt, which what it is, he very well knows, though we are at preſent ignorant of it, and will obtain it for us. What I ſaid to prove the truth of this Interpretation, Mr. *H.* likes well enough; only he does not *approve the ſtaking down the ſence of the Text to this matter onely.* And therefore in the firſt place he *will not give way to Dr.* Hammonds *Tranſlating the word* ἀσθένεια *miſery or diſtreſs; for ſeeing there are twenty places perhaps where the word is taken in this ſence* INFIRMITY, *to*

P. 33.

to one where it is taken in the other for AFFLICTION, *he muſt hold it but right to give it here (according to our Tranſlations Engliſh and Latin) its ordiry and Genuine ſignification.* Twenty places *perhaps!* let us take the N. Teſtament for inſtance: There are fifteen places in the New Teſtament where the word ἀσθένεια does undoubtedly ſignifie *Bodily or Worldly diſtreſs*; Therefore *perhaps* there are three hundred places where it ſignifies *Spiritual Infirmity.* And yet 'tis certain, that the word is not uſed above twenty times in the whole New Teſtament. Twice indeed in Mr. *H's.* ſence, *viz. Hebr.* 5. 2. & 7. 28. And ſo is the word ἀσθένημα uſed *Rom.* 15. 1. And there is one other place (ſuppoſing this were one) where the ſignification is doubtful, *viz. Rom.* 6. 19. Again, the words ἀσθενὴς and ἀσθενέω throughout the N. T. are uſed in a ſence anſwerable to that of ἀσθένεια. and in like manner they do all ſignifie in the *Septuagint*, as Mr. *H.* will find, if inſtead of inventing how the Bible ſhould uſe words for his turn, he will conſult the Bible it ſelf. Therefore according to his own rule, *I may hold it but right to give that word in* Rom. 8. 26. *its ordinary and genuine ſignification, viz.* that of outward Affliction.

Now

Now Mr. *H.* thinks that thoſe words, *We know not what we ſhould pray for as we ought*, are rather to be underſtood of that ſtate of liberty and glory which we expect in the life to come, and that the word *likewiſe* will carry it this way. *Mark* it, ſaies he, LIKEWISE *and* ALSO *muſt hold the ſame matter together in this and the former verſes.* But now this is no reaſon at all, if the word *Likewiſe* (mark it) will ſuit with that Interpretation I offered. I had plainly ſhewn how the Text relates to what was ſaid before, *p.* 209. and if the Coherence had not been clear that way, Mr. *H.* had better have ſhewn that it was not, than ſet up another way againſt it, upon ſuch ſlender encouragement as the word *Likewiſe* can afford him. As for his Interpretation it ſelf, it will not hold, for this, amongſt other reaſons: That the words will not bear the ſence it puts upon them, which is this: *We know not*, that is, we *comprehend not* (as he ſaies) the perfection of that bleſſed ſtate we pray for. But the words of the Text are, we know not what we ſhould pray for as we ought, [τὸ γὰρ τί προσευξώμεθα] *i. e.* concerning the very thing it ſelf, whatever it is that the Apoſtle means, we do not rightly know whether it is to be prayed for, whether it is beſt for us or not. But though

though we do not comprehend the ſtate of future happineſs, yet we know moſt certainly, and upon very good grounds, that we ſhould pray for it. That therefore is not meant, but deliverance from affliction during this preſent life, as I have ſhewed, and need not repeat, ſince he is pleaſed to ſay, That this Interpretation is *propoſed with dexterity and authority enough.*

But what if his were the true meaning? it makes no more for the pretence of uttering the immediate ſuggeſtions of the Spirit in Extemporary prayers, than that which I offered. And this he was ſo ſenſible of, that he ſaw it needful to fetch about his deſign another way, *viz.* by *three or four notes*; the Firſt whereof is clearly againſt himſelf: for if the Spirits interceſſion for us be underſtood properly, as he intimates, then thoſe words, *maketh interceſſion for us*, cannot belong to our Prayer at all, therefore neither to the matter nor words of *Extemporary* prayer. The ſecond note is altogether impertinent to the queſtion of *Extemporary* prayer. The Third is, That *there are other infirmities to be helped, in making our prayers, beſides our ignorance what to pray for.* And the Fourth, That *the unutterable groans may very likely be expounded better, with regard to thoſe Infirmi-*

ties to be helped, than to the matter prayed for; that is, though we are ſuch (many of us) as are ſo weak, that we cannot utter our requeſts, or frame our deſires into Petitions; yet by the Spirit we are aſſiſted ſome way, to put theſe ſmall unutterable groans with his good motions together, ſo as they are accepted in heaven. Therefore Mr. *H.* does not think, *that it is in this Authors power to divert that favour which this Text does caſt upon Extempore prayers.* I ſuppoſe he means, that they are from *the Spirit.* But ſurely ſuch a man as he might have ſeen, that all this comes to nothing. Not to inſiſt upon it, that his notion of the *unutterable groans* in the fourth note, is inconſiſtent with his firſt; 1. Let it be granted for once, that the word *Infirmity* is to be taken here in that latitude of ſence, which he is never able to prove; yet 2. The only Infirmity expreſt, is, that we know not what to pray for. Therefore 3. It is *more likely* that the unutterable groans (if they are to be expounded with relation to our Infirmities in praying) do regard that Infirmity which is expreſt, *viz.* concerning the matter of our praiers, than thoſe which are not expreſt. But 4. we will ſuppoſe it *very likely*, That the unutterable groans are to be expounded, as he will have it, *viz.* of our inability

to

to *utter our requeſts, or frame our deſires into petitions*; what will come of it then? Does the Spirit therefore prompt the matter of our prayers to us? No; for the unutterable groans *are not to be expounded with regard to the matter prayed for.* Does the Spirit then help us to words for that matter? Not ſo neither, becauſe the groans are *unutterable*, and with the *good motions* of the Spirit they are accepted in heaven though they be *not uttered.* 5. At this rate of proving from the *unutterable groans*, that the Text *caſts a favour* upon *Extempore prayers*; I do not ſee that they are the prayers of any but thoſe who are *ſo weak that they cannot utter their requeſts, and frame their deſires into petitions*; and all the favour it then *caſts upon their prayers* is this, That the *affections* which he excites in them by his *good motions* are accepted; and ſo they would have been, if they had prayed by a book, and *ſupplyed* their *weakneſs* and defect of *utterance* by the uſe of a good Form of prayer.

But ſays Mr. *H. Extempore prayers do flow moſt genuinely from the motions that are upon the Soul, and which ſo long as they are good, we are to aſcribe to the Holy Spirit.* Therefore *this Text caſts a favour*, &c. The concluſion is modeſtly expreſt; and ſo it had need. An unwary p. 38.

Reader would be apt to make this Concluſion from the Premiſes, That ſo long as *extemporary* Prayers *are good, they are to be attributed to the Spirit*; but theſe are cheating Sayings. I will not allow that even thoſe *good Deſires* have any goodneſs in their *Extemporarineſs*; or in this, that they are *unpremeditated*; much leſs is there any good in *words* that expreſs thoſe deſires, in this, that they are *new invented.* This being remarked, let us now ſee whether extemporary Elocution flows moſt genuinely from good Affections. For that ſeems to be Mr. *H's* meaning: *For*, ſaies he, *when this is granted on all hands, that the Spirit does excite our affections, who is there can ſay what influence, or how much that work alone hath, or muſt have on our Expreſſions?* It ſeems *he* cannot ſay it, and therefore he ſhould have let this Argument alone. But it will be very hard to ſhew from the Text, that *utterance* and *expreſſions* do moſt genuinely flow from *unutterable* groans, or from thoſe motions of the Spirit, by which ſuch deſires are excited. As to the thing it ſelf, the influence which raiſed affections have upon expreſſion, is various, either according to the nature and degree of thoſe Paſſions that are moved, ſome whereof ſet the Tongue at liberty, others lock it up; or according

ding to the ſeveral Conſtitutions and different Circumſtances of men; the ſame height of Affection in ſome, either forcing ſilence, or interrupting their ſpeech, which in others vents it ſelf in freedom and fluency of expreſſion: So that theſe Effects do not fall under any certain Rules, that we are able to aſſigne. Now if all the aſſiſtance which the Spirit affords towards the uttering of extemporary Prayers, be by exciting the Affections, it will come to no great matter; for the Affections themſelves will operate towards this end but as *Natural* Cauſes, and the Effect will be regulated by the quality of the Paſſion, the temper of the Perſon, and ſuch other circumſtances as thoſe are. This muſt neceſſarily be granted, unleſs you will ſay, that the Spirit ſuggeſts words to him that prays, and then the expreſſion is not ſuppoſed to depend upon the exciting of the Affections. But when theſe general Cauſes now mentioned concur towards the expreſſing of a mans Affections in words when he prays, yet even *this work will have* little or no *influence upon the expreſſions*, if a good Memory and a ready Invention of proper matter be wanting; much more if there be not ſome good degree of knowledge in Religion; for otherwiſe he will

finde little to ſay that is to the purpoſe. And if he be to pray before company, his Affections with all theſe Advantages will ſignifie little, if he has not a good ſhare of *Confidence* beſides, either from Nature or from Uſe. Therefore extemporary expreſſions do not ſeem to flow *moſt genuinely* from the moving of good affections. Eſpecially ſince we have Mr. *H*'s. confeſſion, That *many of us are ſo weak that we cannot utter our requeſts, and frame our deſires into Petitions*; and afterwards he tells us of *an able good man, that ſometimes in praying with him alone, did hum and hack ſo, that he never heard any ſo unable to expreſs himſelf in his life, who yet would uſe conceived Prayer only.* A wiſe man the while! Is it not a rare help to devotion, think you, to him that prays, and them that joyn with him, to be in pain for what ſhould come next?

Again, Mr. *H.* himſelf acknowledges
P. 39. *the Gift of Prayer to be a natural or acquired Ability of expreſſing the thoughts and affections with fluency or readineſs in Prayer.* Now as a man of good Affections may want this, ſo they that have little or no ſenſe of God, and conſequently little of Religious or devout Affection, if they be otherwiſe furniſhed

(as

(as you may ſee toward the end of the *Friendly Debate*) ſhall by frequent uſe come to a readineſs and fluency in Praying *extempore* to admiration. Finally, this fluency of expreſſion is ſo far from following *moſt genuinely* upon good Affections, that ſometimes it follows *as genuinely* at leaſt, from very bad ones; from *pride* and *vanity*, and *delight in applauſe*, as when a man being to pray in his Cloſet, can hardly find words for his prayers, but ſhall abound with great variety when he praies before a great congregation, *i. e.* when his fancy is blown up with the breath of the people that are *groaning* under him. I ſhall add, that the deſire of carrying on a Cauſe by Extemporary prayer, and the very zeal for maintaining the repute of ſuch prayer, and for the diſparaging and ſuppreſſing of Liturgies, may come in for another *moſt genuine* cauſe of Extemporary Elocution in prayer.

Habet multitudo vim quandam talem, ut quem-admodum tibicen ſine tibiis canere, ſic Orator niſi multitudine audiente eloquens eſſe non poteſt. De Oratore, Lib. 2.

But after all, if Mr. *H*'s meaning happily ſhould be, That the *Extemporary Invention of matter, is that which flows moſt genuinely from the motions that are upon the Soul:* I ſhould deſire him to explain himſelf farther; For 1. Theſe words ſeem to imply that it does not flow ſo ge-

nuinely from other cauſes; and then they imply that which is falſe: For this will flow more genuinely from a well-furniſht underſtanding, and an orderly diſpoſition of things in the mind, and a good memory, and confidence in ones ſelf, and the like: for take a man with theſe qualifications, though he has no good affections, and he ſhall invent matter faſter than one that hath theſe affections, and wants the other abilities. But 2. if he would hereby inſinuate that a *premeditated* prayer cannot be uttered with ſo good affection, as an *Extempo-*
P. 39. *rary* one; I anſwer, That *it is a conceit exceedingly extravagant, to think that the uſe of a Form is inconſiſtent with the Spirit of Prayer.* They are his own words, and he has ſaid much more to the ſame purpoſe. 3. If he ſhould mean that a tide of good Affections carries a man naturally into variety of Petitions, ſuppoſing he is otherwiſe well qualified for the invention of matter; neither do I think this is to be granted. Sometimes the contrary is true; *viz.* That the reaſon why a man does not run out into many petitions, is not becauſe his affections are not ſtrongly moved, but becauſe they are; that is, becauſe they are ſo vehemently engaged upon one ſingle object, that they can-

cannot eaſily be taken off. An earneſt deſire is more apt to confine the Invention, than to give it liberty. And though variety of matter ſerves to make room for the Affections, yet commonly it diminiſhes their force. The Current is ſwift and ſtrong, where 'tis pent up in a ſtreight place, but loſeth its force as it ſpreads itſelf in a broad channel: which I do not ſay to prove, but to illuſtrate what I mean. For the truth of the thing, I might appeal, as you do ſometimes, to the experience of wiſe and good Chriſtians. But I think it may be diſcerned in an example of greater Authority than theirs, I mean that of our bleſſed Lord and Maſter, where he prayed in the Garden, thrice uſing the ſame petitions, *Father, if it be poſſible, let this cup paſs from me; nevertheleſs not my will, but thy will be done.* The Evangeliſts ſo punctually noting, that every time he left his Diſciples, he went and uſed the ſame words, ſeems to imply at leaſt, that his prayer was confined to this matter; and yet we never find that he prayed with more affection than at that time. Before he began, he ſaid of himſelf, That *his Soul was exceedingly ſorrowful even to the death*; and St. *Luke* tells us, that *being in an Agony he prayed more earneſtly*; which implied

plied that the fervency of his deſire was proportionable to the grief he was under; and ſtill increaſed, as the burden that was upon him grew heavier. But yet his vehemence and earneſtneſs in prayer, did not carry him to new matter; but ſo far as we can find, expreſt it ſelf in the ſame deſires. This may ſerve to ſhew you, that a great concern may rather tend to fix the mind upon one thing, than carry it to divers. Wherefore you did well to ſay, that the Extemporary way

P. 38. *either has in it, or pretends at leaſt, the moſt of warmth and Enlargement of affection.* But the world has been too much abuſed with theſe pretences, though this is not all that is pretended neither. There are thoſe who believe ſuch prayers to be the Immediate ſuggeſtions of the Spirit; and are ſo confident of it, that they will hardly come up to Mr. *H*'s Moderation in ſaying, That *the Circumſtances of praying in a Book, or without it, is not ſo material, as that we ſhould be ſo earneſt*; Which makes me wonder at what he ſaid before, that we *Diſcourſe* and *Debate as if a coldneſs or beadiſhneſs in the performance of this duty, was to be preferred before fervency and importunity.* In which harſh charge, Mr. *H.* conſiders not that we ſpeak for the Spirits helping inward prayer,

er, and ardency of the affections, as much as himſelf. We ſpeak not for coldneſs and beadiſhneſs at all, nor do we deny that the Spirit may help the expreſſion; but that this is promiſed in this Text to *Extemporary* prayer, we may well deny: for after he has ſqueezed the Text to no purpoſe for an Argument, he dares not affirm it; but ſays only, *Who can ſay*, &c. Ibid. and in effect has diſproved it by the ſtory of his friend.

But if this be *all the favour* which the Text caſts upon *Extempore* prayers, that they flow moſt genuinely from good affections, it does not prove them to be ſo Divine, as the *Extempore* men think it does. And if Mr. *H.* conſiders what has been ſaid, he may find that it has not ſo much as that favour for them, and therefore *none* at all. But I ſuppoſe he intended to caſt in a Favour of his own towards 'em, when he ſaid, that the Antients called them *Ex pectore* prayers; He ſhould have done well to tell us who; I think *Tertullian* ſomewhere in his *Apology* ſpeaking of their praying for the ſafety of the Emperour, *&c.* ſays, *Ex pectore oramus*, *&c.* which whether it ſignifies mental or vocal prayer, does neither way imply that it was Extemporary. The matter of the prayer he there ſets down himſelf; and

I leave it to Mr.*H.* to judge, which had been the moſt ſubſtantial *Apology* for the Chriſtians; that they left the words of their prayers to ſudden Invention, when they prayed for the publick ſafety; or that when they prayed, they did ſo from the bottom of their hearts.

As for all Mr. *H*'s following diſcourſe from *p.* 39. to *p.* 48. concerning *Liturgical and Extempore Devotions*; it does not pretend to anſwer any one of my Arguments, but onely ſtarts new Queſtions in which I am not concerned. I did not ſpeak againſt conceived prayers in general, nor againſt prayers conceived *Extempore*, but againſt the opinion of Dr. *O.* and others, that the Extempore Conception of prayer, is one of the gifts of the Spirit promiſed in the Goſpel; which I have diſproved, and Mr. *H.* has not made good, but in effect granted as much as I would have. Therefore I am bound but in civility to anſwer his following Diſcourſe; and to uſe his own words, *I do not care if I tell him ſomething more of my mind* upon the ſubject of this queſtion.

1. Therefore, whereas he ſuppoſes the Ability of praying Extempore to be one
P. 40. *of the Gifts which are adminiſtred to men by Gods Spirit for the Edification of the Church*; I think on the other hand, that

it

it does not deſerve the name of a *Gift*, as he uſes the word. And he has not done well to apply that Text to it: *As every one hath received the Gift, even ſo miniſter the ſame one to another, as good ſtewards of the manifold grace of God.* By *Gift* we mean a Gift of the Spirit proper to the times of the Goſpel, or elſe we abuſe the word. But a *Natural Ability*, or an *Acquired Faculty* of expreſſing the thoughts and affections fluently and readily, is not ſuch a Gift, though it may be uſed in prayer or preaching: no more than *Rhetorick* or *Logick*, or any other natural abilities, which though they come from God, and are ſometimes uſed in Divine things, yet muſt not be accounted Gifts of the Spirit, ſuch as the New Teſtament ſpeaks of. Again, his granting *Extempore* Elocution in prayer, to be from a Natural or Acquired Faculty, overthrows the concluſion which he deſires from the Text that has been diſcourſed on. For ſuch a faculty, being common to the wicked and godly, and equally applicable to profane as holy uſes, cannot be meant by thoſe aſſiſtances of the Spirit *promiſed to the children of God, for ſupport under their afflictions.* P. 34.

2. I think that he has in vain endeavoured to ſhew that Extempore praying in

in the Pulpit, has any valuable advantage above uſing a Form there. For 1. As to *the Spirits pitching the hearts of the Miniſter upon thoſe things which are moſt proper to be acted in behalf of a particular Congregation*; if Mr. *H.* could prove that he doth ſo *ſometimes*, which is all he pretends, this might with ſome colour be urged in behalf of the Miniſters uſing ſome other prayer than what is preſcribed in the Liturgy; but it makes nothing for an Extempore prayer in oppoſition to a Form of his own compoſing: For Mr. *H.* plainly acknowledges, not onely that *we may humbly conceive, that the Spirit of God did pitch the hearts of the Compoſers of the Liturgy, upon that matter, which is moſt agreeable to our publick Congregations*, but alſo that a *Miniſter who hath not the gift of praying Extempore*, may expect this aſſiſtence of the Spirit, *viz. To be put in mind of thoſe things that are fitteſt* to be prayed for, when he *takes as much pains* to compoſe his *prayer* as his *Sermon*. Therefore that which Mr. *H.* calls *the Spirits pitching the heart* upon matter moſt ſuitable to a ſingle Congregation, is not peculiar to *Extempore* praying. I ſhall onely add, That he who takes the moſt care not to utter any thing in his prayer, unbeſeeming the Majeſty

P. 42, 43.

P. 46.

jeſty of God to whom he ſpeaks, ſeems to be beſt qualified for the aſſiſtence of the Spirit; for we are never more ſure of his Grace, than when we uſe our beſt endeavours. But I leave it to you to conſider, whether he that premeditates his prayer, let him have the *Extempore* abilities or not, be not moſt careful. If this be true, here is the Spirits aſſiſtance towards fit matter ſecured, though *Extempore* prayer be quite excluded. 2. What Mr. *H.* ſays concerning the *ruſting of the Miniſters parts and gifts*, by uſing Forms onely, is I think not very conſiderable. I know of no other gift that will ruſt by it, but *Confidence*, which ſerves more for the oſtentation of him that ſpeaks, than for the Edification of the Hearers. In this reſpect I ſuppoſe the difference is not great between *praying* to God, & making an Oration to men. If it will not *ruſt the Parts* of an Orator to conſider beforehand what he is to ſay, & to compoſe his Speech in his ſtudy, neither will it hinder a mans praying *Gifts*, (as they are called) to premeditate his petitions, and to put them into a Form, before he prays in publick. And I think *Tully* is therefore as fit to decide this point, as Mr. *H.*

P. 46.

Etſi utile eſt etiam ſubito ſæpe dicere, tamen illud utilius ſumpto ſpatio ad cogitandum, paratius atque accuratius dicere.----Si ſubitam & fortuitam Orationem, Commentatio & cogitatio facile vincit, hanc ipſam profecto aſſidua ac diligens Scriptura ſuperabit. De Orat. Lib. 1.

But

But the Orator thought a man improved himself more by thinking his Speech beforehand, and writing down the most material passages of it, than if he should make Speeches *Extempore*, as *Philip* the Consul was wont to do. Indeed if a man would get great reputation for speaking, it is good sometimes to venture at an *Extempore* Oration, as *Tully* acknowledges, for thus he will gain confidence and readiness; and to speak well on a sudden, is more admired than to utter an Oration that was composed before. But I hope Mr. *H.* does not think that the Applause of men may be made one end of Prayer. 3. Mr. *H.* thinks it another advantage of *Extempore* praying, that it quickens the affections more than a Form. But the Argument he brings to prove that it does, will prove that it does not. *For a fluent expression, a raised voice, a zeal in the delivery, a melting Soul-touching phrase out of Scripture, with newness and variety of the same*, are (as he says) those *circumstances incident to Conceived prayer*, which *raise the affections*. But they are not incident, as he pretends, *to a set Form*: And I wonder at him for saying so; unless by a set Form, he means just one set Form, and

Philippus *ita solet ad dicendum surgere, ut quod primum verbum habiturus sit, nesciat; & ait idem cum Brachium concalefecerit se solvre pugnare.* De Orat. Lib. 2.

P. 44.

and then I confeſs, the *Newneſs and variety of the ſame*, does not belong to it. But to *many* ſet Forms, *the variety is incident*, and ſo are all the reſt of thoſe *raiſing* things now mentioned: As they can well witneſs, who made you believe they praied *Extempore* an hour together in the Pulpit, when they uttered nothing but what they had conceived and contrived before they came thither. And of theſe men there were good ſtore in the late times. If you never knew any; it may yet ſatisfie you, that there is nothing in *Extempore* praying, which may not be perfectly imitated in the making and repeating of a Form; not only thoſe things you mention, but others which are a great deal more proper to it; ſuch as Diſorderlineſs of Method, Abruptneſs of Sentence, endleſs Tautologies, Fantaſtical Phraſes, and Labouring looks and poſtures, and ſuch like Circumſtances, which I do not charge all men withal that pray *Extempore*; but which are the moſt aſſured tokens of a mans praying ſo, that can be thought of. And yet he that has the vanity to make his Form believed to be a ſudden Effuſion, if he be a man of any Art, ſhall ſerve himſelf with ſo much of all theſe colours, as may be enough to make his prayer look like *Extempore*,

and none of you all ſhall be able to diſcern the difference.

I am reſolved, at this time not to diſpute the worth and profitableneſs of thoſe affections, which the *Extempore* way commands ſo eaſily as you pretend; but ſince it commands them by virtue of thoſe advantages which are, or may be common to the uſe of a Form, this is a clear Argument, that a Form may ſerve this purpoſe well enough. And therefore if Mr. *H.* thinks it as reaſonable that the
P. 45. *Nonconformiſts* ſhould have *Extemporary Prayers* to raiſe their affections, as to allow *Organs* and *choice Singing-men* for the *exciting of the Devout Conformiſt*; I deſire it may be alſo conſidered, that the Nonconformiſt ought in all reaſon to be enlivened with a Form of *Extempore* tuning; for if it will not make good Muſick in his ears, unleſs he believes it to be right *Extempore*, it is as unreaſonable as if the Conformiſt ſhould be dull and diſcontent at the melody of a Quire, becauſe the Muſick of it was ſet by a skilful Maſter, and is not all Volunteer. The truth is, if Mr. *H.* would ſpeak out, he ſhould ſay, That the main thing which moves the people of the Separation at an *Extempore* prayer, is their own belief that it is *Extempore*. For let a man uſe

a Form, with all the other advantages that way can pretend to, if they do but underſtand it is a Form, they can be as quiet as if they were hearing *Common Prayer* all the while. And the reaſon is plain, which is this, That they have been made to believe that Extemporary prayers are the very dictates of the H. Spirit, but Forms are things of mere humane Invention and Contrivance. And ſo long as they are thus prepoſſeſt with favour to the one, and prejudice againſt the other, no wonder that they are ſo differently affected under them. The very *hum* and *hack* of a flat *Extempore* prayer, if it be not groſsly nauſeous, ſhall be reverenc'd; and there is no need of thoſe *raiſing* circumſtances mentioned by Mr. *H.* to make it affecting, if it be but believed to be conceived on the ſudden. But as for the Common-prayer-book they had learnt to call that an *Idol*, and they have ſtill ſuch a contempt of all Book-prayers, that unleſs they could operate as they ſay Charms can do, the moſt *Seraphick* Compoſures ſhall never be able to ſtir their paſſions. If it were lawful to imitate their Extravagance, and to pay them in their own Coin, we might with much more appearance of reaſon, accuſe them of *Idolizing* Extempore prayers, ſeeing they have no

leſs a conceit of them, than that they are immediately ſuggeſted by the Spirit of God. Concerning the Liturgy, we ſay with truth and modeſty, that it contains a Form of praier compoſed by very wiſe and holy Biſhops and Martyrs, which is very fit to expreſs, and to unite the deſires of good Chriſtians, when they are aſſembled for the publick worſhip of God. But the people, I ſpeak of, conceit nothing leſs of *Extempore* praiers, than that they are the very Oracles of God, and the Breathings of the Divine Spirit; and then how can they chooſe but melt under them, when their opinion has made their affections ready for it, before a word is ſpoken? Being thus prepared, I grant that they are wrought upon more or leſs, according to the ſpeakers abilities in Tone and Fluency, and the reſt. But the Engine that firſt makes their paſſions pliable, and then ſets all on work, is the extravagant opinion they have entertained of the Extemporary way itſelf, as if they that uſed it, did not ſpeak of themſelves, but as the *Spirit gives them utterance.* It were eaſie to ſhew what pernicious Conſequences this miſtake has had, and what farther miſchiefs it may come to in time, if better care be not taken. But that they who

who believe it, have been horribly cheated and abuſed, is eaſie to be made out from thoſe paſſages of your own, which I have already obſerved, & many more that I have not. But it had been ſtill better if you had ſaid nothing to countenance the Impoſture. In particular, I cannot underſtand why you ſhould declare, That if the *Biſhops* would not ſuffer *Extempore* praiers in publick, *you do not know any argument of ſo much weight, and like to be prevailing with Religious people againſt Common praier as this*; that is, if theſe *religious people* be ſtill as ignorant as ever they were, and muſt be kept under their miſtakes and unreaſonable prejudices, to carry on the Cauſe more effectually. But if they will hearken to what you ſay, concerning the unlawfulneſs of Separation upon ſuch pretences, *the Argument* will be of no weight at all, nor ever *prevail with them.* In this you have done like an honeſt man, and I would to God that all they who lead the Separation, were but as honeſt in all points, as you are in this, and would tell the people of their way, who will hearken to them more readily a thouſand times, than to all the Arguments we can bring, That the uſe of Forms, without any Extempore praiers at all, is lawful, and may be very profitable.

P. 40.

P. 47.

If they would lay aſide their popular deſigns, and diſabuſe their followers, by letting them know what they themſelves believe is lawful to be done in Obedience to Authority, we ſhould need no other *cure* for the Diviſions of the Church; there would ſoon be an end of all diſputes about *Lay-Conformity*: and if by going thus honeſtly to work, they would encourage the Government to be more favourable to them, thoſe few Controverſies they have with us beſides, would eaſily be compounded. And I pray God they may follow your Example, before it be too late for both of us to wiſh they had.

But to come to a concluſion of this matter; ſince you have left it to me in part, to *give judgment* from what you have ſaid, *how far a conceived prayer*, (you ſhould ſay a praier conceived *Extempore*) is to be preferred before a Form; I think this judgment may be given even according to your ſelf; That a conceived Extempore praier, has nothing in it above a Form, but the adding of a *natural or acquired faculty* of uttering words fluently, which the Scripture has nowhere expreſſed to be a part of praier. I deny not but it might be of ſome uſe, if all men that were to pray publickly, were

Good,

Good, and Fluent, and Prudent; and yet it would be better if the Miniſter did beforehand conſider what he ſhould ſay; as you your ſelf intimate. And this is to be ſaid with theſe cautions likewiſe, that there be no oſtentation; if men do not make the external circumſtance of ſudden invention of words, to be the great matter of praier; if they do not attribute that to the immediate Influence of the Spirit, which does not belong to it; if they do not call praying by Forms by wicked names, and the like. And thus much concerning *Extempore prayer*, about which if I have ſaid more than the defence of my own undertaking required, yet I have not ſaid ſo much, as the liberty you have taken in this ſubject, might have given me occaſion. P. 46.

To the 6th Chapter, *Concerning thoſe to whom the H. Spirit is promiſed and given*, Mr. *H.* anſwers;

1. That I am a young man. P. 53.

2. That he does not approve the Notion I offered concerning *Common* and *Special* Grace; and that becauſe I have altered the uſe of Terms *that have gotten into our Divinity, our Sermons, and practical Books; ſo that I am not aware of what I do*, that is, *of the much*

hurt, and ill conſequence that may come of this boldneſs, when the *raw Divine takes them up*, and uſes them as I do. *For inſtance*, what if *a green Preacher comes and tells his Congregation after this Author, that all that hear him are in a ſtate of Grace? How odde muſt this appear to the Hearers, in any judicious Congregation?* Muſt it ſo? Then what if the ſame green Preacher, having read his Book too, comes and tells that judicious Congregation, that not only they are *all* in a ſtate of Grace, but *all* the
P. 64. *Heathen* too, as Mr. *H.* expreſly ſays; where he taxes me, though cauſeleſly, for excluding them? Doth he not think that this would ſound ſomething more odly than the other? But, ſaies he, *let this Author explain himſelf, and the matter admits of no contradiction.* Therefore if this Author has done it already, why ſhould you tax him of boldneſs, and think to eſcape your ſelf, eſpecially ſince you, it ſeems, were *aware* of the *ill conſequence*, which I was not? For ought I can ſee therefore, we muſt both of us agree, that no man ſhould be afraid to make things plain, merely becauſe ſome or other will be blundering about them when all is done. But there is indeed one ill conſequence of that liber-

liberty I took to explain the difference between *common* and *ſpecial* Grace, and I was well enough aware of it, *viz.* that it might leſſen the credit of ſome *Books* and *Sermons*, where the diſtinction is uſed to ſave the *Hypotheſis* of Abſolute Election. But if that be all the evil conſequence, I am content to venture it. The Terms themſelves do very aptly ſignifie what I meant by them; and others have uſed them ſo before me, who liked the diſtinction ſo well, that they would have it uſed to ſignifie ſome truth. If the Doctrine of Irreſpective Decrees concerning the eternal ſtate of all men be true, there is no ſuch thing as Common Grace, either out of the pale of the Church, or in it: For common Grace, with you, is that which the Reprobate have; and that, if plain truth may be ſpoken, is no Grace at all, according to your Principles; becauſe it can ſerve to no other purpoſe but to increaſe their Condemnation. And I ſhall preſently ſhew, that Mr. *H.* will not ſo much as allow it the name of Grace, becauſe 'tis common to All, that is, to the Elect and to the Reprobate. Therefore I applied the diſtinction to another matter, proving what I meant as well as I could by Reaſon and Scripture;

pture; which if I have done fully enough, then I am of the ſame minde as when I told you, that *the accurate uſe of this diſtinction is not that which I contend for:* If I have not done it, Mr. *H.* had better have animadverted upon the matter it ſelf, than upon the terms in which it is expreſt. He ſaies,

3. That the Heathens may be ſaved; Therefore the *Homo Evangelizatus is not the onely ſubject of Gods Grace*; Therefore *this Gentleman is a little too Orthodox in his Heterodoxie*, becauſe *when he holds forth a Common Grace vouchſafed to all who live under the Goſpel*, &c. *he does leave all the world beſide in ſuch a ſtate as is without all Grace:* That is, becauſe I did not mention the *Heathen* at all, therefore I did exclude them. It was well I eſcaped the charge of excluding the *Jews* before the coming of *Chriſt*; for I ſaid not a word of them neither. My deſigne was to ſpeak of the Operations of the Spirit within the Church, as you may ſee, *chap.* 1. and therefore I was not concerned to engage in that Controverſie of the Salvabilitie of *Heathens*. But if Mr. *H.* had not put in the word *onely*, when he was repreſenting my opinion concerning that Grace which is common to all under the Goſpel, and

P. 55.

ſo

ſo feigned this Opinion for me, *That the Heathens cannot be ſaved*, he had wanted an occaſion of bringing in that diſcourſe of his to prove the contrary; which indeed wanted nothing but a little more pertinencie, to have been a ſingular Ornament to his Book. I am altogether of his minde in that matter, and whatever reaſon he had to publiſh his thoughts about it, you will ſee I have more than one to thank him for it.

Indeed towards the end of his Diſcourſe upon this ſubject, he pretends that I exclude the Heathen from all Grace, becauſe I ſaid, They were *in a ſtate of Nature onely*. But let any man look into the place, *p.* 42. *Introd.* and he ſhall ſee that I there oppoſed the ſtate of Nature, not onely to being a Member of the Chriſtian Church, but likewiſe to being under the Law of *Moſes*; and that by Grace there, I meant the miniſtration of the Goſpel; and by conſequence, that I did not exclude the *Heathens* any more than the *Jews* from a poſſibilitie of Salvation, by virtue of that Sacrifice and Covenant, which yet they knew little of: finally, therefore not from Grace in that Notion wherein Mr. *H.* there underſtands it. P. 64.

4. He requires a *better explanation* P. 66.

from

from me, how every one under the Goſpel is by the Spirit enabled to believe, while yet believing is the condition of obtaining the Spirit. And here he had me at ſuch an advantage, that he was reſolved to hold me to it; ſhewing me the diffieultie ſeven times at leaſt, and making me faſt, by that binding ſentence:

P. 67. *To be the Condition which is Antecedent to a thing, and to be the Effect alſo which follows it, is methinks incompoſſible.* And then he gives me leave to trie whether I can ſtir or not: *He may ſhift perhaps and diſtinguiſh*, but now let me alone with him. Now this triumph had better have been acted in his imagination onely, where it was begun, than have come abroad. For all this buſtle is not againſt any thing I have ſaid, but what he has dreamed and fancied for me. I had ſaid and proved that Faith is an effect of the Holy Spirit, *p.* 161. and yet in ſome other places I had occaſion to ſay, That believing was the condition of obtaining that promiſe of the Spirit mentioned in St. *Luke* 11. 13. and ſo I ſay ſtill. What then? Do I therefore ſay we muſt firſt believe, that the Spirit may be given to enable us to believe? No ſuch matter, but when we believe through the Spirit, we are capable of his Aſſiſtance for farther ends, which what

what they were, I ſhewed plainly enough both in the ſecond and fourth Chapters. But whereas Mr. *H.* ſaies, that *the Spirit is promiſed in St.* Luke *in regard to all its effects, if that which I ſay in two Chapters about it be valid*; and therefore becauſe *I make Faith to be one thing promiſed there, I can never make it out how it ſhould alſo be the Condition of the Promiſe:* This is one Inſtance of his careleſneſs; for *p.* 79. & *p.* 160. I had ſaid expreſly that the Holy Spirit was not promiſed in that place to produce Faith, becauſe the promiſe is made to Believers. If I ſhould follow Mr. *H.*'s example, and aſk *how will he come off here*, I do not think he were able to give a good account of his making ſuch a coil with this Objection. All that I meant, and ſaid, is by himſelf approved in his approbation of thoſe words: *That the Operations of the Spirit in us, make us capable of recovering our ſelves by degrees*, p. 322. And he has not done well to object St. *Paul*'s Converſion to this truth; For his Converſion was wrought by extraordinary means, and that for an extraordinary end, of propagating the Goſpel more effectually, which was then newly made known to the world. But though he was made a Believer by means that were not

not common, yet being a Believer, he was thereby qualified for thoſe promiſes of Grace which did not belong to him before. And this is the importance of thoſe Sayings, which Mr. *H.* deſires a *better explanation* of.

The Argument which in the fifth place he offers againſt the Suppoſition of that common Grace, whereby it is poſſible for
P. 68. all that hear the Goſpel to believe, and by degrees to be qualified for Salvation, is that in which Dr. *O.* has been beforehand with him; and in the following Book he may finde what I had to ſay to it, *p.* 198, *&c.*

His next Argument is this; *That Grace or Favour imports a reſpect ſhewn to ſome, which is not to others: If any thing be a mattter of Favour, it muſt be vouchſafed to one, and not to another, when it*
P. 71. *is due to neither.* If *the Operations* of the Spirit *were indeed Common, and vouchſafed to thoſe that believe and repent not, as well as thoſe that do, this were not of Grace. If one be not preferr'd, and not another, or before another, there is no Grace.* Therefore *'tis inconſiſtent with the Nature of Grace,* that it ſhould be *Common.* This is a ſtrange
P. 78. Argument for a man to uſe, who *feels his Genius afraid of a Captivity by that we*

call

call Orthodoxiſm: An Argument which ſetting aſide *Envy* and *Ill-nature*, has not the leaſt appearance of Truth! Mr. *H.* has not backed it with Reaſon, or Authority; and I might very well content my ſelf with affirming the quite contrary, and leaving it to indifferent men to judge of. The truth is, that Grace is not the leſs, but the more, for being common, is one of thoſe things which ſeem to be ſo evident of themſelves, that a man knows not which way he ſhould go about to prove them.

I do not finde that the word *Grace* is reſtrained to his Notion by the Scripture: Sometimes it ſignifies *Reward*; as in *Luke* 6. 34, 35. where χάρις is explained by μισθὸς. And again τοῦτο χάρις ἐστὶ. *This is thankworthy, if a man for Conſcience*, &c. 1 *Pet.*2.19. By which you may ſee, that the Term ſometimes imports even the retribution of a good work; and conſequently, that may be ſaid to be a *matter of Favour*, which is by vertue of God's promiſe *due* to well-doing; and is therefore vouchſafed to one and not to another, not becauſe God reſpecteth the perſon of one man more than another, (which this Gentleman ſaies very confidently, muſt go into the Nature of Grace) but becauſe one is qualified, and

and the other not. The word is moſtly uſed to expreſs undeſerved Benevolence and Kindneſs. Thus 'tis taken 2 *Tim.* 1. 9. *Who hath ſaved us ----not according to our works, but according to his own purpoſe and Grace*, &c. Not for the ſake of *Works*, therefore of *Grace*. Again, Tit. 3. 4, 5, 6, 7. *Not by works of Righteouſneſs which we have done, but according to his Mercy he ſaved us*, &c. *that being juſtified by his Grace, we ſhould be made Heirs.* So likewiſe Epheſ. 2. 8, 9. *By Grace are ye ſaved through Faith, and that not of your ſelves, it is the gift of God; not of works, leſt any man ſhould boaſt.* Does the Term *Grace* in theſe places, imply any thing more than that the Kindneſs of God is undeſerved; or is it implied, that this kindneſs *muſt be vouchſafed to one, and not to another?* But that no ſuch difference with reſpect to perſons is implied in the Term *Grace*, is I think plain from *Acts* 15. 11. *But we believe, that through the Grace of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt we ſhall be ſaved, even as they*; that is, as the *Gentiles*, concerning whom St. *Peter* ſaid, v. 9. *God put no difference between them and us, purifying their Hearts by Faith.* Had it not been very improper to aſcribe it to the Grace of

Chriſt

Christ that the *Gentiles* ſhould be ſaved as well as the *Jews*, if Grace conſiſts in taking in ſome and excluding others? Was it not of Gods Grace that he put no difference between the one and the other? How then does Grace conſiſt in putting a difference?

To ſpeak to the thing: if ſome muſt be excluded, that an undeſerved kindneſs may become *Grace*; then the more they are that are excluded, the Grace is greater; and therefore it had been greateſt, if all but one had been excluded from the mercie of God. Will Mr. *H.* ſay that Grace had then been greater in it ſelf, and more Glory due to the kindneſs of God upon this ſuppoſition? I trow not; for ſurely the Grace of God would be computed as well with reſpect to all that are not made ſavable, as to *that one perſon* that is ſaved. But perhaps the greater thanks would be due from *that one*. I ſay, No; if there be truth in the difference between moral good and evil. For I am to be thankful for the goodneſs of God towards another man, as well as towards my ſelf. This is natural to a good man, and inſeparable from the Spirit of Chriſtianitie, whereby we are trained up to Charitie, which is the perfection of Religion, and Vertue,

and Happineſs; and are required to pray for all, and to give thanks for all; and this, upon the ſtrongeſt motives, and in imitation of the beſt examples, God himſelf,& his holy Son *Jeſus*. Now if the benefit of Gods goodneſs to one man is not the leſs, becauſe his goodneſs is alſo communicated to others; much more if he be alſo ſo diſpoſed as to rejoyce in their happineſs, then the Grace of God could not have been ſaid to be *greater to him*, had all others been excluded, but, all things conſidered, *leſs*. From whence 'tis plain, that Grace is not the leſs, but greater, both with reſpect to the Honour of God, and the Happineſs of Men, for being ſhewn to all. For I am not onely to be thankful that God has ſhewn mercie to me, who am unworthy of it, but that he has been merciful to other men; and therefore to all men who are likewiſe unworthy. If ſome or moſt of 'em do not uſe this mercie ſo as to eſcape by it, I am to be ſorry for them; in the mean time acknowledging and praiſing that goodneſs of God by which they might have been ſaved. The truth is, Mr. *H.*'s notion of Grace, with his diſcourſe upon it, is againſt common ſenſe, the bottom of it being this: That whatever benefit I may receive from another, the Grace

Grace of the Benefit is in ſome meaſure loſt; and I owe leſs thanks to the Benefactor, if he does but ſhew the ſame kindneſs to another perſon, who needs it, and is altogether as capable of it as I my ſelf. But if for this reaſon I ſhould undervalue the Kindneſs, and leſſen my Gratitude, might not the Benefactor ſay to me, *Is thine eye evil, becauſe I am good?* And ſhould I not deſerve to be counted an envious man? And yet if Mr. *H*'s notion of Grace be true, I ought not to be blamed.

But as this is contrary to common ſenſe, ſo I think 'tis againſt the particular ſenſe of Mr. *H.* in another place, *viz.* where he ſpeaks of the Salvabilitie of the Heathen in this manner: *The Remedying Law is written in the heart of man, in regard to his faln nature, no leſs than the Law of pure Nature it ſelf*; and that *this Law of lapſed Nature, is the Law of Grace or Mercy toward man in regard to that condition.* P. 56. &c. Again, that *the light of Reaſon will dictate to us, when we have fail'd in our duty to repent and turn to God, with truſting to his mercy and pardon if we do ſo, and not elſe.* Finally, that *we finde it as legible in our hearts that God is good, and wiſely gracious to pity our Infirmities, and conſider our loſt eſtate, and ne-*

ceſſary frailty, as that there is a God. Light is not more contrary to Darkneſs, than Mr. *H.* is to himſelf in theſe points. For, 1. he makes the Remedying Law, that is, of Repentance and Pardon, to be *Univerſal*, as indeed it is. 2. He calls this Law a *Law of Grace*, as I think he has good reaſon. 3. He ſaies this Law of Grace is written in the heart of man, *no leſs* than the Law of *pure Nature* was; which I think is more than he had need to ſay. Now he comes and tells us, not long after, that the Grace by which men are enabled to Convert, is not common or univerſal, otherwiſe it is not Grace. If this be ſo, then that is not a Law of Grace which hath provided a Remedy for all; for the univerſalitie of the Remedy takes away the Grace: for
p. 75. *if Grace be as common as Nature*, ſaies Mr. *H. why is it called Grace?* But if to make it a Law of Grace, you will have the remedy provided for *ſome only*, then 'tis either falſe that a remedying Law is written upon mans heart, or elſe a lye is written upon the hearts of ſome men, in that the remedying Law is written there. But ſurely when Mr. *H.* ſaid, that it was *no leſs written, than the Law of pure Nature*, he meant that it was written with no leſs *Truth*; or elſe he wrote deceitfully himſelf.

I confeſs he has provided ſome defence for himſelf, by affirming that *Power to believe and repent is of Nature*, and by granting to the *Pelagian* that *every one* may without Grace *live according to* P
what he hath if he will; upon which ſuppoſition the New Covenant is a Remedy for all, for *the Object is propounded to all, the Duty known, and every man hath his Faculties, his Will and his Executive power, and ſo every one that will believe and repent may do ſo.* Now whether this will reconcile him to himſelf, will appear by obſerving what he ſaies on the other ſide to clear himſelf from *Pelagianiſm* and *Arminianiſm*, *viz.* that however *if any man wills, it is of the Grace of* P. 77.
God againſt the Pelagian, and *it is of Gods ſpecial Grace againſt the Arminian.* Here are then two things to be conſidered. 1. That although he grants all men to have a natural power to believe and repent, yet without Grace there is not any of them, that *does ever exert that power into Act*, as he ſpeaks. Now P. 75.
if amongſt the far greater part of Mankind, whom God has left onely to their Natural Power, there is not, nor ever will be ſo much as a ſingle inſtance of Converſion by it; there cannot be a greater demonſtration of the Inſufficiency, or (if I may ſo ſpeak) of the weak-

neſs of this power. And then I deſire Mr.*H.* to reconcile his excluding all thoſe from Grace, with his affirming, that *we find it as legible in our hearts, that God is good, and wiſely gracious to pity our Infirmities, and conſider our loſt eſtate, and neceſſary frailty, as that there is a God.* Again, that which he ſays without truth of the *Arminian Grace*, as he invidiouſly calls it, is evidently true of this his Natural Power, *viz. As for* this Natural power, *what good of that, which if one had it not he ſhould have pleaded a Cannot, and been excuſed; but by having it he muſt be condemned?* He indeed muſt be condemned according to Mr. *H*'s principles, who has no other power but that of Nature to improve. But we ſuppoſe no ſuch neceſſity of his condemnation, who has that Common Grace to improve, which accompanies the Miniſtration of the Goſpel. But 2. while he grants that all men have a power to repent if they will, in words; he really denies the thing. *Power*, he ſaies, *is of nature, but to exert that power is of Grace.* But if a man cannot exert his natural power of believing and repenting, without Grace, then without Grace believing and repenting is utterly impoſſible; for 'tis as impoſſible to believe and repent, without exerting the Power ſo to do, as if there were no

P. 77.

ſuch

ſuch power at all. Again, he tells us *power is of Nature*, *but to will and to do is of God.* Now to *will* is the firſt part of the Condition of Salvation: Can a man perform that without Grace? Yes, *he may if he will.* Nay, but to will is of God, as you ſaid at firſt. And therefore he may if he will, is as much as to ſay: He may do that without Grace, if he does what is not to be done without it: or elſe thus; he may perform the Condition, if he does perform it. And if this be all the power you allow to your Natural man, it will ſtill remain as impoſſible for him to perform the Condition without Grace, as if he had no Natural power at all.

Some of you ſay, as Dr. *Owen* can witneſs, that 'tis as impoſſible to convert without Grace, as for the dead to raiſe themſelves; and theſe men I think make it Naturally impoſſible. But I do not ſee that Mr. *Truman* and Mr. *H.* have mended the matter much, by bringing in their *moral Impotency*: for if that be ſuch, that 'tis impoſſible to will without that Grace which is given but to a few, they give the reſt a poſſibility upon the *Natural* account with one hand, which upon the *Moral* one they take away with the other. To ſay that a *man may if he will*, when that very thing to will, is ſuppoſed impoſſible,

is an idle ſaying, in my judgment. I believe Mr. *H.* underſtands more things than I do; and if he underſtands this, I am ſure this is one of them. *Moral Impotency* ſignifies either want of ſufficient reaſons to cauſe a determination of the will; and in this ſence many a wicked man has *moral power* to repent and do well, as being under the ſenſe of weighty and cogent reaſons why he ſhould; but in this ſence you do not underſtand the phraſe: Or elſe *Moral Impotency* ſignifies the Averſion of the Mind to that which is good, and the bent of it to evil; and then by *Moral power* we muſt underſtand Abhorrence of evil, and cleaving to that which is good. 'Tis in this ſence Mr. *T.* and ſome others underſtand the Terms; and we ſay with them, That all men have *Natural*, but not *Moral* power in this ſence. But when they ſay the Natural power will never be exerted, where the Moral power is wanting, they do but ſay in other words, that a man can never be a good man till he is ſo; which I hope is to ſay nothing. To ask therefore, whether a man can become good without moral power, is a frivolous queſtion; for moral power is Goodneſs and Virtue it ſelf, as they underſtand it, and nothing elſe. But there is ſence in asking whether by the uſe of the *Natural* power, up-

upon the propounding of Arguments and Motives to Repentance, the *Moral* may be obtained. Mr. *H.* I ſuppoſe, is agreed with us againſt the *Pelagians*, that without the help of Divine Grace, or the Internal Operations of the Spirit, it cannot. But he leaves us when we ſay that ſuch Grace is given to All, whereby they may convert, and *will* and *do* that which is pleaſing to God. For if he ſaies any thing towards the later end of this Paragraph, it is this, That all men are ſo wicked before Converſion, that 'tis Impoſſible any of them ſhould become good without that Grace which is given but to a few in Compariſon. If he would ſpeak plainly, this is that which he would have; and let him reconcile it if he can to that *remedying Law*, which, he ſaies, *is written in the hearts of all men, with regard to our Faln nature*, which is likewiſe *for the publick good*, otherwiſe it were no Law (and yet if his opinion that *Grace* is *no grace* if it be common to all, be true, there can be no law of Grace for the *publick good*,) laſtly, which is *no leſs reconcileable with the eternal Law, or the reaſon of Gods wiſdom and goodneſs and juſtice than the Law of Works, this being for the ſtate of mans Innocency, the other for his lapſed condition.* But in the Law of *Works* nothing was required impoſſible to man

man *Innocent*, therefore in the Law of *Grace* nothing is required impoſſible to man *Faln* from his Innocence, or to man under the diſadvantage of that *Moral Impotence* which he contracted by his fall. Therefore the Conditions of the Covenant are not impoſſible to any to whom they are preſcribed. Therefore to all ſuch, Grace is given whereby they are poſſible.

In the laſt place, Mr. *H.* offers a Reaſon from the Scriptures, which carries him contrary to his *Inclination and Genius* into the belief of Abſolute Election, and all the other points that depend upon it. This reaſon he calls a *chain which is laid on his Soul by the Holy Scriptures, which holds it faſt; and the chain conſiſts of theſe Links: Perſonal Election, Regeneration, and Few ſhall be ſaved*; which *three Doctrines are ſo Concatenated (in his mind) one with another, that ſo long as any one of them will hold, it is in vain to make any attempt to get looſe from either of the other.* Whether I can help him here, I am not certain; for I confeſs I am a ſtranger to this way of arguing by Chains, in which one cannot readily ſee which is the Concluſion, and what are the Premiſes; eſpecially by a Chain of

P. 78.

ſo

ſo wonderful a Nature, that though you break all the links but one, the chain is yet as ſtrong as it was before. But towards the later end of this Paragraph, I perceive the point he would prove, is that of Abſolute Election. *If it be* P. 83. *Gods decree then that few ſhall be ſaved, I cannot be ſolicitous any farther about Perſonal or Abſolute Election.* Now it is to the belief of this, that he is tyed by a chain of three links, whereof the firſt is *Election.* And Election, he ſaies, *is the preparation of Effectual Grace for ſome* P. 81. *perſons that they may be Converted, and not for others.* As obſcure as this definition is, one may yet perceive that he does not mean Election to Glory, but to Grace. If that which he intends then be this, that God hath abſolutely decreed to give to ſome perſons that Grace by which he knew they would Convert and perſevere; it does not follow from hence, that *Election* to *Eternal life* is Abſolute: for that may ſtill be Conditional, and the Condition be no other than perſeverance in Holineſs. But if he means that God has decreed to afford that Grace to a few perſons *onely*, with which they muſt convert, and without which no man can; and if this were true, it would indeed follow, That Election to Eternal Life were

were *abſolute* and *perſonal*, at the ſecond hand at leaſt: for ſince, as Dr. *O.* grants, *our future happineſs depends upon our Holineſs in the Councils of God*; if God has abſolutely decreed that ſome men ſhall be holy, and left it impoſſible for all the reſt to be ſo; 'tis in the end all one as if he had abſolutely elected the perſons of the former, and rejected the later from life and ſalvation. But then he muſt prove that God hath decreed thus to beſtow his Grace, and to deny it: for ſaying will not do the buſineſs. The firſt link of the chain that holds Mr. *H.* to the Concluſion, is the Concluſion it ſelf; which is ſomewhat ſtrange, becauſe he pretends an unwillingneſs to believe it. The truth is, ſince he himſelf could find
P. 79. out other more paſſable notions of Election in the Scripture, than that which he contends for, he ought not to have made Election one link of the chain, unleſs he could produce ſome teſtimony of Scripture, where the word is uſed in his ſence, and for his purpoſe. And then that place of Scripture ſhould have been the *Link of the Chain*, and not the Concluſion proved by it.

Let us then try the ſecond *Link*, *viz.* that of *Regeneration*. Here he begins to argue: *If there be ſuch a thing as Regeneration*,

ration, that is, a work of Grace on the P. 81.
Souls of ſome perſons, whereby they are begotten again to a Holy Life, as well as to the Relation of the Children of God; then is Election, I muſt ſay, actuated in ſuch perſons. That is to ſay, either, that if there be ſome perſons, who through the Grace of God do ſincerely perform the Conditions of the Goſpel, then theſe were abſolutely Elected (which conſequence no man can believe without having a dear mind to it) or, (taking Regeneration in Dr. *Owens* Notion) if ſome men are made new Creatures by an Inſtantaneous Act, and an Irreſiſtible Operation of the Spirit upon their Souls, then 'tis very likely that theſe are *the Elect*, or *thoſe whom*, as he ſaies, *God decreed to ſave out of the periſhing multitude of mankind, from whom in his eye they did not then differ in the leaſt.* Election, as Mr. *H.* goes on, *is the preparation of effectual Grace*; and *Effectual Grace vouchſafed, is the Execution of Election. Such dependance have theſe Doctrines one upon another*, that if you grant abſolute Election, it will follow, That ſome perſons are Regenerated by an Irreſiſtible Operation; or if you ſuppoſe that men are ſo Regenerated, it will go very hard, if ſome-body does not prove

prove that they were abſolutely Elected. Theſe two links indeed are very kind one to another, and muſt either hold or break together; and if that be all their ſtrength, as it is for ought I ſee, Mr. *H.* need not fear *getting looſe* from them.

And therefore let us try the third,

P. 82, 83. *Few ſhall be ſaved: Theſe*, ſays he, *are the words of our Lord; If this be a truth then, it is a truth, that it is Gods will that few ſhall be ſaved; and conſequently if his will, his Decree. If it be Gods decree then that few ſhall be ſaved, I cannot be ſolicitous any farther about perſonal or abſolute Election.* The ſtrength of this Argument, I think, lies in this; That they are *but few* that ſhall be ſaved. If therefore the Concluſion would follow as well from the quite contrary, if it had been ſaid; he has no great reaſon to truſt this Argument. Suppoſe then our Saviour had ſaid, that not a few only, but *many* ſhall be ſaved; Mr. *H.* might ſtill have argued: If this be a Truth then that *many* ſhall be ſaved, then 'tis Gods *Will* that many ſhall be ſaved; and if his *Will*, his Decree; and if his Decree, I cannot be ſolicitous any farther about Perſonal or Abſolute Election. Whether *few* or *many* ſhall be ſaved, it is all one as to the Queſtion between Abſolute and Conditional

onal Election: for inſtance, if but few ſhall be ſaved, then upon ſuppoſition of Abſolute Election and Reprobation, the reaſon is, becauſe the reſt *could not* be ſaved; and upon ſuppoſition of Conditional Election, the reaſon is, becauſe the reſt *would not*. And on either ſuppoſition it might be truly ſaid to be Gods will, that but a few ſhall be ſaved; with this difference indeed, that in the former caſe his will muſt be ſuppoſed to be abſolute and unaccountable, but in the later reaſonable and evidently juſt. Therefore merely from hence, that 'tis Gods will that but few ſhall be ſaved, the Doctrine of Abſolute Election cannot be concluded. That which he ſaies in purſuance of this Argument, is nothing but what he has perſwaded himſelf to believe in favour of *his Hypotheſis*. *There appears to me*, ſays he, *really to be a greater diſhonour put upon Gods goodneſs and infinite mercy, to make him decree ſalvation to all on ſuch conditions, as a few perſons only (left to their liberty) ſhall thereupon be able to be ſaved, than can be caſt merely on his Juſtice, or Righteouſneſs, to decree that grace, or ſuch grace to theſe few perſons that ſhall effectually bring them to that end.* Now P. 83.

1. By ſaying, that *a greater diſhonour* is put upon God the former way, he implies that

that *ſome diſhonour* is put upon him the later. But God ought not to be diſhonoured at all. Indeed 'tis no diſhonour to his Juſtice, to ſave ſome perſons by an Irreſiſtible power; but that which Mr. *H.* has not expreſt, would be ſo; *viz.* to condemn others to the puniſhments threatened by the Goſpel, for not performing thoſe conditions thereof, which to them were always impoſſible. 2. That way by which Mr. *H.* ſuppoſes the *greater* diſhonour done to God, is altogether of his own Invention; for no man but himſelf puts the caſe thus; that God hath decreed Salvation to All on ſuch conditions, as a *Few perſons onely* (left to their liberty) ſhall thereupon be *able to be ſaved.* For thoſe of Dr. *O*'s way do not ſo much as ſuppoſe that God hath decreed Salvation to *all*; and we ſay that he hath done ſo upon ſuch conditions, that *not only a few perſons*, but *all* ſhall thereupon *be able* to be ſaved. For we ſay that although few ſhall be ſaved, yet the reſt ſhall be condemned for neglecting that Salvation, which they might have obtained. And this way puts *no diſhonour* upon God at all.

I ſhall ſay nothing to Mr. *H*'s. Animadverſions upon the laſt Chapter, concern-

ing

ing the *manner and meaſure of the H. Spirits* Operations; but that he makes a needleſs inquiry into the difference between Dr. *O.* and my ſelf concerning that Queſtion; for I had ſhewn it plainly enough; and that he barely declares his own opinion, and tells me *that I am out*, without offring to Anſwer any one of thoſe Arguments by which I endeavoured to ſhew that I was *not out*.

And now I thank Mr. *H.* for his *Diſquiſitions*; and I am very glad that he hath ſet a good Example of Moderation in Controverted points, and of Civility to an Adverſary. Where his zeal for his friend (and ſome commendableneſs too there is in that) did not tranſport him, he has treated me with ingenuity enough. And though he has given me a wipe now and then, he has yet done it in a cleanly faſhion; and I thank him for that too. But as for the injuries which he has given me occaſion to complain of, they were not done by Mr. *Humfrey*, but by Dr. *Owens* friend.

THE CONTENTS OF THE SECOND PART.

CHAP. I.

What Dr. O. *means by Works* Preparatory *to Regeneration.* p. 2. *That in this matter he brings down the Goſpel to* Ariſtotles *Philoſophy.* p. 5. *The true Notion ſhewn.* p. 6. *with the obſcurity and deceitfulneſs of the Doctors.* p. 7. *What* Works *are preparatory according to him.* p. 10. *His obſcure account of Illumination.* p. 11. *His miſtakes concerning Conviction of ſin.* p. 14. *and Reformation of life.* p. 16. *That he pretends to ſhew wherein theſe works fall ſhort of Regeneration, and makes nothing of it.* p. 17. *That when all is done, they are, according to him, good for nothing.* p. 25. *And that he has not offered any good reaſon why a man ſhould endeavour after them.* p. 29. *His opinion concerning the manner of the H. Spirits Operation in preparing us.* p. 34. *And the ill conſequence of it.* p. 39. *That his Doctrine tends to fill the minds of men with moſt unreaſonable doubts, and fears.* p. 41. *That his method to Converſion is an intricate, and unintelligible thing.* p. 44.

p. 44. *That it goes backward and forward unaccountably.* p. 47. *That he ſpeaks plainly and honeſtly concerning this matter, in one place.* p. 49. *His cunning in that too.* p. 51. *But he confounds all again preſently.* p. 52. *An Expoſtulation with him concerning his diſhoneſty in matters of this ſerious nature and concern.* p. 56. *That he corrupts the Notion of Regeneration by his account of the Preparations to it.* p. 61. *The Concluſion of his method of Converſion, with Obſervations upon it.* p. 64.

CHAP. II.

That the true preparedneſs for Converſion is of great conſequence. p. 68. *That the two principal preparatives according to the Scriptures, are* 1. *a* Meek, Teachable Spirit. p. 70. *and* 2. *a* ſerious concern for everlaſting life. p. 72. *The needfulneſs of a Meek Spirit.* p. 77. *and of concern for the End, in order to Chriſtian Faith and knowledge.* p. 78. *The neceſſity of both in order to Chriſtian practice,* i. e. 1. *To an humble ſubmiſſion to all the Laws of our Saviour.* p. 79. *and* 2. *to a due application of the General Rules of the Goſpel to our particular Actions.* p. 81. *That theſe Preparations are the principal, and will ſecure the end.* p. 86. *Becauſe all other Preparations are either implied in theſe, or naturally conſequent upon them.* p. 87. *The true difference between the ſtate of Regeneration, and of preparedneſs for it.* p. 90. *What is to be done, on our part, that we may be thus prepared.* p. 94. *That theſe directions are of uſe to the Regenerate themſelves.* p. 98.

CHAP. III.

Whether the Nature of Regeneration depends upon the manner wherein it is cauſed. p. 100. *That from the ſtate of man before Converſion, the Doctors opinion concerning the manner wherein Grace Operates, cannot be concluded.* p. 102. *Of Spiritual Darkneſs and Blind-*

Blindneſs. p. 104. *Of underſtanding or believing* ſavingly. p. 105. *Dr.*O's *Argument from* Epheſ. 4. 17,18. *for the neceſſity of an Irreſiſtible Illumination.* p. 110. *That St.* Paul *does not there ſpeak of the ſtate of all men by Nature.* p. 112. *but of Idolatry, and cuſtom in ſin.* p. 114. *The deſign of the Apoſtle in that place.* p. 18. *How extravagantly the Dr. argues from the Ignorance of wicked men.* p. 120. *He quotes Scripture to prove no body knows what.* p. 123. *He allows the unregenerate ſo much knowledge, as confutes what he ſaies of their Ignorance.* p. 126. *That he makes two Irreſiſtible Acts neceſſary to Converſion, one upon the underſtanding, another upon the will.* p. 129. *He takes occaſion from hence to rail at his Adverſaries exceedingly.* p. 130. *His Argument from the Analogy of Death Spiritual to Death Natural, expoſed.* p. 132. *That the Almighty Act cannot be proved neceſſary to Converſion from hence, that the Unregenerate are ſaid to be Dead.* p. 137. *He endeavours in vain to anſwer that common Objection againſt his Doctrine, that it makes the Laws of God, and the Revelations of the Goſpel uſeleſs,* p. 138. *That his firſt Anſwer, is but a repetition of the Objection in other words, & in effect a confeſſion that 'tis too hard for him.* p. 139. *That the propoſition of the ſecond Anſwer is falſe.* p. 141. *Of the end and uſe of Laws, Exhortations, and Promiſes.* p. 142. *The difference between us and the* Pelagians *in this matter.* p. 145. *The third Anſwer deceitful, and contradicts the Doctors own principles in one ſence, and comes not up to the Objection in the other.* p. 147. *He propounds another Objection againſt himſelf,* viz. *That his opinion chargeth God with the unrighteouſneſs of requiring Impoſſible things, and then puniſhing men for not performing them; but is not able to anſwer it.* p. 150. *Of having power to obey in our firſt parents.* p. 152.

p. 152. *That the Dr. would fain lay the blame of the Damned upon themſelves, and that his principles will not let him do it.* p. 162. *He is driven to that extremity, that he ſuppoſes a man may be puniſht for being able to do evil.* p. 164.

CHAP. IV.

Of arguing from the ill conſequences of an Opinion. p. 167. *The Dr. pretends that our perſwaſion concerning Grace, makes the whole Glory of our Converſion to be our own.* p. 168. *And to make good this pretence, miſreports the ſence of his Adverſaries.* p. 169. *How far we agree with him concerning the manner wherein the Grace of God operates towards Converſion.* p. 172. *Wherein we differ.* p. 176. *The ill conſequence he chargeth upon our way examined.* p. 178. *That the glory of our Converſion is Gods, becauſe it is an effect of his word.* p. 179. *This proved by ſeveral plain Teſtimonies of Scripture.* p. 180. *That the promiſe of Eternal life, takes from us all ground of boaſting.* p. 183. *This point illuſtrated and confirmed by* 2 Cor. 4. 17. *compared with* 2 Cor. 11. 23. p. 184. *That this motive joyned with all others, leaves no pretence for glorying in our ſelves.* p. 188. *That we aſcribe Converſion to the Internal Operations of the H. Spirit, applying theſe Motives to our minds.* p. 190. *An Impious ſaying of Dr. O. concerning the Moral Operations of the H. Spirit.* p. 191. *That the very Grace of Gods providences excludes reaſon of boaſting.* p. 193. *That upon our grounds, we do aſcribe the whole glory to God,* Originally *and* Comparatively. p. 195. *Mr.* Humfreys *Argument which pretends to ſhew that we do not, anſwered.* p. 199. *That Mr.* H's. *Metaphyſicks are againſt common ſenſe.* p. 202. *The true meaning of* 1 Cor. 4. 7. p. 203. *That the difference between the good and the bad is of mans making.* p. 204. *And yet the whole glory is due to God,*

God, from the good. p. 206. *The plain Engliſh of the Doctors charging us with aſcribing the glory to our ſelves, and not to God.* p. 207. *His opinion tried by the proviſion it makes for Gods glory.* p. 208. *That ours aſcribeth all that glory to God, which is ſecured by his.* p. 209. *That his would deprive God of that glory which is aſcribed to him by ours.* p. 210. *That Gods grace is more glorified by good practices than by right opinions.* p. 213. *An Anſwer to the next conſequence,* viz. *That according to us it is uncertain whether any one would be converted unto God or not.* p. 217. *That this does not follow from that part of our perſwaſion which we are moſt concerned for.* p. 218. *Nor indeed from any part of it.* p. 220. *The bare poſſibility that no man would convert, is an objection of no force.* p. 221.

CHAP V.

Epheſ. 1. 19, 20. *explained.* p. 222. *Dr. O's. falſe gloſs upon* 2 Cor. 4. 6. p. 225. *That we are not merely paſſive in Converſion, becauſe we are ſaid to be created and born again.* p. 227. *Why God is ſaid to give a New Heart.* p. 228. *How we are to underſtand that expreſſion of Gods giving Repentance.* p. 132. Deut. 29. 4. *explained.* p. 233. *Dr. O's. way of Interpreting Scripture.* p. 235. *Of praying for Grace.* p. 236.

CHAP. VI

Concerning the Nature of Holineſs. p. 241. *That it is not hard to underſtand what Holineſs is.* p. 242. *That the Dr. himſelf in one place deſcribes it well enough.* p. 243. *But yet moſt unreaſonably pretends the Notion of it to be abſtruſe, and has indeed repreſented it unintelligibly.* p. 247. *That he denies that to belong to the Nature of Holineſs, which does belong to it,* viz. *Moral Virtue.* p. 248. *That he has corrupted the Notion of that too.* p. 249. *What we*

mean

mean by Moral Virtue. p. 250. *In what ſenſe Holineſs and Virtue are the ſame thing.* p. 252. *Our concluſion proved from ſeveral paſſages in Dr.* O's. *diſcourſe.* p. 253. *His Objections to the contrary anſwered.* p. 256. *The reaſons of thoſe ſeveral phraſes, by which the keeping of Gods Commandments, is expreſt in the Scriptures.* p. 259. *That the Dr. adds ſomething to the Nature of Holineſs that doth not belong to it.* p. 261. *It is not neceſſary to Holineſs, that the Habit thereof be infuſed.* p. 262. *The dangerous conſequence of the Doctors opinion in making this neceſſary.* p. 264. *That Gods abſolute Election of a man does not belong to the nature of Holineſs.* p. 266. *The ill conſequence of the Doctors opinion in this matter.* p. 267.

CHAP. VII.

That Regeneration and Sanctification are the ſame thing. p. 270. *That one may be more a child of God, and therefore more Regenerate than another.* p. 271. *In what reſpects a good man may grow better.* p. 273. *That according to the Dr. a good man cannot do well, nor grow better, but by an Immediate and Irreſiſtible Operation of the Spirit.* p. 276. *His deceitfulneſs and contradicting of himſelf in this matter.* p. 277. *The dangerous conſequences of his Doctrine.* p. 278. *which he would avoid by cheating words, and diſſembling his opinion.* p. 280. *The proper motives wherewith to perſwade good men to grow in grace.* p. 283. *The means which they are to uſe for this end.* p. 285. *That their Improvement being an effect of means and motion, is not cauſed by an Immediate and Irreſiſtible Operation.* p. 288. *The Concluſion of the Second Part.* p. 290.

ER-

ERRATA.

PAge 40. lin. 12. for *greateſt* r. *greeneſt.*
Page 47. lin. 5. for *teaſing* r. *tearing.*
Page 56. lin. 21. for *amaze* r. *amuſe.*
Page 59. lin. 29. for *employing* r. *imploring.*
Page 69. lin. 28. for *Sermon* r. *Sermons.*
Page 70. lin. 33. blot out *if.*
From p. 113. to p. 129. in the running Title, for *Death* r. *Darkneſs.*

In the Anſwer to Mr. H.

Page 62. lin. 5. for *acted* r. *asked.*

A DISCOURSE Concerning The OPERATIONS OF THE HOLY SPIRIT.

The Second PART.

CHAP. I.

Concerning the Work of the Holy Spirit preparatory to Regeneration, according Dr. Owen.

SECT. I.

IN the former Part I endeavoured to lay together what the Scriptures teach us concerning the *Operations of the Holy Spirit*, and by the way to confute ſome Opinions of Doctor *Owen*, which ſeemed neceſſary to be removed, in order to the better clearing of the Truth.

Now that I may do what ſervice I can to the Truth, and all that right to the Doctor which he can reaſonably deſire, I ſhall in this *Second Part*, conſider the whole *Scheme* of his Doctrine concerning this point; and where it is oppoſite to ours, I ſhall examine all the *Arguments* wherewith he pretends to prove his own Opinion, and his *Anſwers* to thoſe Objections that have been made againſt it.

All that he ſaith concerning this Argument may be reduced to three heads. 1. The work of the Spirit which is *preparatory* to Regeneration. 2. The work of the Spirit in *Regeneration it ſelf*. 3. The work of the Spirit in the *progreſs of Sanctification*.

I ſhall ſhew that under every one of theſe Heads the Doctor ſays many things that are not onely *falſe* or frivolous, but of dangerous *conſequence* to the Souls of men; and this, I hope, will juſtifie, to every honeſt Chriſtian, my undertaking to confute them.

To make good this charge, I begin with the *Preparatory works of the Spirit*, which he treats of, *Book* 3. *Chap.* 2. And here I ſhall enquire, 1. What he means by works *Preparatory* to Regeneration. 2. What thoſe *Works* are, which he ſaith, are Preparatory to Regeneration. 3. In *what manner* he ſuppoſeth the Holy Spirit to produce them.

SECT.

SECT. 2.

Concerning the *First*, he tells us, that *there are certain previous and Preparatory Works or Workings in and upon the Souls of men, that are antecedent and diſpoſitive unto Regeneration.* So that there are certain works *previous* to Regeneration, which are *antecedent*, that is, *previous* to Regeneration. For both thoſe words ſignifie juſt alike; but, being of a Latine extraction, it was more than every Engliſh Reader could ſay. A mere miſtake about a word does not deſerve reflection; but if a *learned* man goes about to ſtate the ſubject of his Diſcourſe, and ſeems to ſay ſomething when he ſays nothing, this is not very honeſt. His explaining *Preparatory*, by *Diſpoſitive*, has a more hopeful appearance; for this ſeems to reſtrain the *Preparatory works* to thoſe qualifications of the minde, which we uſually call *Diſpoſitions*. And this indeed is the notion upon which his following Diſcourſe proceeds. P. 191.

But I do not ſo well underſtand to what purpoſe he ſhould trouble his Reader preſently, with the Philoſophy of that venerable diſtinction between a *material* and *formal* Diſpoſition, unleſs he were afraid to be underſtood: For certainly he has explained it by the moſt untoward inſtances that a man could light upon. *A material Diſpoſition*, he ſaith, *is that which diſpoſeth, and ſome way maketh a ſubject fit for the reception of that which ſhall be communicated, added, or infuſed into it, as its Form. So Wood by drineſs and a due compoſure, is made fit and ready to admit of* P. 191.

Now that I may do what ſervice I can to the Truth, and all that right to the Doctor which he can reaſonably deſire, I ſhall in this *Second Part*, conſider the whole *Scheme* of his Doctrine concerning this point; and where it is oppoſite to ours, I ſhall examine all the *Arguments* wherewith he pretends to prove his own Opinion, and his *Anſwers* to thoſe Objections that have been made againſt it.

All that he ſaith concerning this Argument may be reduced to three heads. 1. The work of the Spirit which is *preparatory* to Regeneration. 2. The work of the Spirit in *Regeneration it ſelf*. 3. The work of the Spirit in the *progreſs of Sanctification*.

I ſhall ſhew that under every one of theſe Heads the Doctor ſays many things that are not onely *falſe* or frivolous, but of dangerous *conſequence* to the Souls of men; and this, I hope, will juſtifie, to every honeſt Chriſtian, my undertaking to confute them.

To make good this charge, I begin with the *Preparatory works of the Spirit*, which he treats of, *Book* 3. *Chap.* 2. And here I ſhall enquire, 1. What he means by works *Preparatory* to Regeneration. 2. What thoſe *Works* are, which he ſaith, are Preparatory to Regeneration. 3. In *what manner* he ſuppoſeth the Holy Spirit to produce them.

SECT.

SECT. 2.

Concerning the *First*, he tells us, that *there are certain previous and Preparatory Works or Workings in and upon the Souls of men, that are antecedent and diſpoſitive unto Regeneration.* So that there are certain works *previous* to Regeneration, which are *antecedent*, that is, *previous* to Regeneration. For both thoſe words ſignifie juſt alike; but, being of a Latine extraction, it was more than every Engliſh Reader could ſay. A mere miſtake about a word does not deſerve reflection; but if a *learned* man goes about to ſtate the ſubject of his Diſcourſe, and ſeems to ſay ſomething when he ſays nothing, this is not very honeſt. His explaining *Preparatory*, by *Diſpoſitive*, has a more hopeful appearance; for this ſeems to reſtrain the *Preparatory works* to thoſe qualifications of the minde, which we uſually call *Diſpoſitions*. And this indeed is the notion upon which his following Diſcourſe proceeds. P. 191.

But I do not ſo well underſtand to what purpoſe he ſhould trouble his Reader preſently, with the Philoſophy of that venerable diſtinction between a *material* and *formal* Diſpoſition, unleſs he were afraid to be underſtood: For certainly he has explained it by the moſt untoward inſtances that a man could light upon. *A material Diſpoſition*, he ſaith, *is that which diſpoſeth, and ſome way maketh a ſubject fit for the reception of that which ſhall be communicated, added, or infuſed into it, as its Form. So Wood by drineſs and a due compoſure, is made fit and ready to admit of* P. 191.

firing, or continual fire. From whence 'tis very clear, that Wood can never burn out into Smoak and Aſhes, till you have ſo diſpoſed it, that the *form* of *firing, or continual fire*, may *be communicated, added, or infuſed into it.* Juſt ſo, for all the world, does the Spirit *diſpoſe* the Soul to *receive* the *form* of *Regeneration.* For he tells us, *the Diſpoſitions* he *intends are onely materially ſo*: But he cannot *allow* them to be *formal* ones. Now a *Formal Diſpoſition is where one degree of the ſame kinde diſpoſeth the ſubject to farther degrees of it.* This I confeſs may be underſtood, and that much better without the following example than with it. *As the morning-light, which is of the ſame kinde, diſpoſeth the Air to the reception of the full light of the Sun:* As if the *Air* could not be *diſpoſed* to receive *the full light of the Sun* at *Midnight*, if the Sun were but as well *diſpoſed* to *give* it.

Ibid. P. 152.

'Tis one of the Doctors leaſt faults, to bring ſuch inſipid talk as this into a Diſcourſe that pretends to be ſerious; and therefore I do not take notice of it ſo often as he gives occaſion. But ſurely his hearers are under a low Diſpenſation, if they can miſtake ſuch *chaffie* ſtuff as this for the *Bread* of Souls.

'Tis pity that he obſerved ſo late what he tells us in his late Book of *Juſtification*; That *the mixing of Evangelical Revelations with Philoſophical Notions, hath been in ſundry ages the poiſon of Religion*; and that *Exotick, Pedagogical, and Philoſophical terms trouble the faith of Chriſtians.* And thus, I hope, he takes leave ſolemnly of hard words: But if he would pleaſe to look over his

Juſtif. *J. O.* P. 5, 7.

his former Writings, he might ſoon perceive this *Age* has not been altogether free of the fault: For he would finde that *he* himſelf has *poiſoned Religion*, and *troubled the faith of Chriſtians*, by mixing *Philoſophical Notions* (and thoſe none of the beſt neither) with Evangelical Revelations. For inſtance, he findes in the Scripture, that *He that is in Chriſt is a new creature.* Now it would do him great ſervice to get this expreſſion of a *new Creature* underſtood in the proper ſence: To which end, if you will but believe that Regeneration is a *new Form* and being *ſuperinduced* into the Soul, let him and *Ariſtotle* alone for proving that the *new Creature* is to be underſtood properly. I confeſs he does not name *Ariſtotle*; but I challenge him to ſhew any other ground for his conceit, but *Ariſtotles Hypotheſis of ſubſtantial Forms*; to which, any one that underſtands his Philoſophy may perceive, the Doctor has adapted his notion of Regeneration; and he keeps ſo cloſe to it here, that he will by all means have thoſe *Preparations* he is going to ſpeak of, to be the *material Diſpoſitions* fitting the Soul to receive that *new Form* of Regeneration, by which it becomes *properly* a new Creature. Does the Doctor think that the writers of the New Teſtament took care that it ſhould jump with *Ariſtotle*'s Philoſophy, and with one of the meaneſt fancies too that can be found in it? I have ſhewn him that his Divinity in this point is not to be found in the Scriptures: If he hopes to make it good by Philoſophy, I refer him to Mr. *Pemble, de Origine Formarum.*

All that he aims at here in the uſe of theſe

artificial Terms, is to let us know, that thoſe *Diſpoſitions* of Minde, which he intends, are not of the ſame *nature* and *kinde* in a leſs *degree*, with Regeneration it ſelf: But whether they be ſo or not, does not belong to this place to enquire, where the Reader is to learn what we mean by Works *preparatory* to Regeneration. For whether they be of the ſame *kinde* with Regeneration or not, cannot be well known, before we know what the *Works* themſelves are; for till then we cannot compare them together, to ſee wherein they *agree*, and how far they differ the one from the other. But when I come to conſider the Doctors *preparatory Works* themſelves, I ſhall not forget how wide that difference is which he makes between them and the ſtate of *Regeneration.*

That is ſaid to be *preparatory* to ſomething elſe, which is a *means* in order to it; and therefore *Works preparatory* to Regeneration, are neither more nor leſs than thoſe works which are the *means* of Regeneration. Wherefore I cannot but acknowledge the truth of what our Author ſays of
P. 191. theſe works in the firſt place, *viz.* that *Regeneration doth not conſiſt in them*; for it is certainly true, that the *means* are one thing, and the *end* another.

Now although *all the means* of Regeneration are in a true ſence *preparatory* thereunto; yet Divines have been accuſtomed to reſtrain this term, *preparatory*, to *one* ſort of *means*, viz. to certain internal effects which are wrought upon the Souls of men, by the Word and Spirit of God. And if I underſtand the Doctor, they are preparatory works of this ſort, which he treats of in this Chapter.

But

But though I acknowledge that Regeneration *does not conſiſt in* the works preparatory thereunto, yet I underſtand not why the Doctor ſhould add, *Nor can it be educed out of them.* The expreſſion is very odd, and may ſignifie as the Doctor pleaſes. If he intends onely, that when we have uſed all outward means as well as we can, and have gained the inward preparations, yet the effect cannot be produced, till the laſt act of the grace of God bleſſes all, and compleats the work of converſion: This indeed is very true; after *planting* and *watering*, all will be ineffectual till God gives the increaſe. But that which rather ſeems to be his meaning, is, that God will not always bleſs the means in order to their end; for he ſays in another place of this Chapter, *that all things preparatory to Regeneration may be wrought in the mindes of men, and yet the work of Regeneration be never perfected in them.* Now where *all the internal preparations* P. 156. *are gained*, it may reaſonably be ſuppoſed, that all the *external means* of Regeneration have been *uſed* too, ſuch as *repairing to Church*, and *hearing Gods Word*, and the like, (which he mentions in the beginning of this Chapter.) For the *in-* P. 191. *ternal preparations* are to be gained by the *out-* marg. *ward means.* Wherefore the Doctor does in effect tell us, that Regeneration may not be gained by the utmoſt uſe of *means*: For you may be never the nearer by the inward preparations, ſince *all things preparatory may be wrought in your mindes, and yet the work never follow.*

To the like purpoſe he tells us, That *theſe O-* P. 202. *perations in the mindes of men are oftentimes pre-*

paratory unto a real Converſion; which implies, that *ſometimes* they are *not* preparatory thereunto:
P. 196. and yet in another place he ſaith, that they are *in their own nature good, uſeful, and material preparations unto* Regeneration, *diſpoſing the minde to the reception of the Grace of God.* But by this phraſe of *good, uſeful, material preparations* or diſpoſitions, you may now be more certain of his meaning, when he ſays *Regeneration cannot be educed out of them.* For his *material diſpoſition* is that by which the Soul is made *fit for the reception* of the form of Regeneration: wherefore his meaning in the former paſſage ſeems clearly to be this; That the Soul may by all kinds of preparatory works be made fit to receive Regeneration, and yet Regeneration may never be communicated to the Soul. In this point indeed he has left *Ariſtotle*, by making *Grace* to do all that *in vain*, which the Philoſopher would never allow *Nature* to do.

Preparatory works, I grant, may be conſidered, either as they are *bare diſpoſitions*, or a *frame of minde*, by which it is fit to receive a farther effect of grace, or as they *proceed from God*, who cauſes them in the minde antecedently to another effect. In the former ſence they may be truely ſaid to be preparations in the *minde*, whether the effect of Regeneration follow or not: In the latter ſence they cannot be ſaid to be *Gods* preparatory works, where he intends not the effect of Regeneration: neither can they be called antecedent or previous works of Grace, without relation to ſome conſequent work, to which they are antecedent in the deſigne of God who works them. Therefore the Doctor ought not

not to have called theſe his *preparatory* works, Works of the *Holy Spirit* preparatory unto Regeneration, which is the title of the Chapter.

To conclude, when the Doctor ſays, there are certain works *preparatory* to Regeneration, you are not to underſtand him thus, That thoſe who are *prepared* as they ought to be, ſhall not fail of *converting grace*; or that *the* due uſe of *all proper means* (which is implied in the Souls being prepared and diſpoſed as it ſhould be) will prevail, and be ſucceeded by the ſtate of *Regeneration it ſelf*: But you are to underſtand him thus, That amongſt thoſe who are by the uſe of *means* equally fit to be regenerated, *ſome* ſhall have regenerating Grace, and *ſome* ſhall go without it when all is done. So that the Doctor's *material diſpoſitions*, or his *good uſeful preparations* (as he calls them) for converting Grace, might have been defined thus: *They are* certain works which make the Soul *fit for the reception* of that grace which ſhall *not* be infuſed into it, as well as *for the reception* of that which *ſhall*; as he *fallaciouſly* ſaid.

Thus I have ſhewn you, as well as I can, what he means by works *preparatory* to Regeneration; which I ſhall have occaſion to put you in minde of again, when I have done with the next point.

SECT. 3.

Secondly, I am to ſhew you *what thoſe works are* which he ſays are preparatory to Regeneration:

tion: and to reduce his diſcourſe upon this Head into ſome method, I ſhall, 1. Shew what he affirms concerning theſe Works as they are conſidered *by themſelves*. 2. What he affirms of them, with *reference* to Regeneration.

P. 192. 1. He ſaith it is required of us, in order to our Regeneration, to give, 1. *An outward attendance to the diſpenſation of the Word of God.* 2. *A diligent intention of minde in attendance on the means of Grace*; *and, he ſays, there is nothing herein but what is in the liberty and power of the rational faculties of our Souls, aſſiſted with thoſe common aids, which God affords to all men in general.* This is a ſaying for which another would have been ſeverely taxed. *A diligent intention of minde*, ſuch as *Lydia* had, whoſe *heart the Lord opened*, that ſhe attended to what *Paul* ſaid, ſeems to be from the ſpecial grace of God. If the Doctor by *all men in general*, means all that are under the miniſtration of the Goſpel; and that this *intention of minde* may through thoſe aids of the Spirit, that are common to them, be obtained by degrees; I grant his meaning to be true, though he has not well expreſt it. But to let this paſs, he ſaith, the ſpiritual effects wrought by theſe means, are *Illumination, Conviction, and Reformation:* And theſe are the *works*, which according to him are preparatory to Regeneration.

P. 193. 1. *Illumination*, whereby he underſtands *all the knowledge we have in ſpiritual things*; and he makes three degrees of it. 1. *That which ariſeth merely from an induſtrious application of the rational Faculties of our Souls to know and underſtand revealed*

led Doctrines. By this he underſtands *a mere natural knowledge of ſpiritual things*, as he tells us ſoon after: But 'tis often hard to ſay when the Doctor ſpeaks his minde; for not far from this place he ſaith, that *all the things mentioned*, whereof this is the firſt, *are effects of the power of the Spirit of God*; and then this degree of Illumination is not *merely* natural. But, 2. Another degree, is that Illumination which is *an eſpecial effect of the Holy Ghoſt by the Word on our mindes.* I do not ſee what other reaſon there can be, to make this ſecond degree of Illumination, but an affectation not to be underſtood; ſince he that induſtriouſly ſearches the Scriptures, to finde the Minde and Will of God there, cannot reaſonably be ſuppoſed to want the *eſpecial aſſiſtance* of the Holy Ghoſt. If the Doctor means onely, that the ſame induſtry and aſſiſtance being continued, a mans knowledge will be increaſed; he might then have aſſigned an *hundred degrees* of *Illumination*, or as many as there are degrees of knowledge in divine things amongſt Chriſtians, as well as *two* or three.

P. 194. P. 197.

He pretends this ſecond Illumination is noted in thoſe words of the Apoſtle, *Hebr.* 6. 4. *Once enlightened.* Now if the Apoſtle had ſpoken of men that had been *twice enlightened*, there had been a little more colour for the producing of this Text to his purpoſe; but if Dr. *Owen* can make *once* to ſignifie *twice*, he can never want a proof for any thing.

But perhaps we may better underſtand what he means by this ſecond Illumination, if we conſider how (as he tells us) it *variouſly affects the Minde*,

P. 194.

Minde, and makes a great addition to what is purely natural: For, 1. *It adds perſpicuity unto it, making the things diſcerned in it more clear and perſpicuous to the Minde. Hence men endued with it, are ſaid to know the way of righteouſneſs; that is, they know the doctrine of the Goſpel, not onely or merely as true, but as a way of righteouſneſs.* If this ſecond degree of Illumination helps to make divine things *perſpicuous*, to your ſelves I ſuppoſe, I could wiſh you had a *third*, to make you write more *perſpicuouſly* than you do. Let any man compare this paſſage with what went before, and make *ſence* of it if he can: For every man that has induſtriouſly ſearched the Scriptures, and thereupon *knows the Doctrine of the Goſpel to be true*, does thereby know it to be the *way of Righteouſneſs*; ſince if it were not *that way*, it could not be *true*, becauſe it pretends to be that *way*. Wherefore in effect he tells us, that whereas before this ſecond degree of Illumination, the induſtrious man *knew the Goſpel to be onely and merely true*; *now 'tis grown ſo perſpicuous, that he knows it to be true.* 2. *It adds a greater aſſent to the truth of the things revealed*; which it muſt needs do, if it makes the things more clear and perſpicuous to the minde. At this rate he may multiply his additions without end. But how does he prove this? He proves it by ſaying, that *thoſe who are thus illuminated are frequently ſaid to believe*, (by which I perceive that they who are *onely* ſo far enlightened, as to know the Goſpel to be *true*, are mere Infidels) as *Simon the Magician*, Acts 8. 12. *and ſundry of the Jews*, John 2. 23, 24. *ergo*, the ſecond degree of Illumination *adds a greater aſſent* to the things revealed. If the Doctor can make theſe things hang

hang together, he needs not deſpair of making a Rope of ſand. 3. *It adds ſome kinde of evanid Joy: And* 4. *it adds oft-times Gifts alſo.* But that the *joy* muſt needs be *evanid*, and that theſe things are wanting under the *firſt* Illumination, and added by the *ſecond*, he brings not the leaſt ſhadow of proof.

From all which it may be concluded, that his diſtinction between theſe two *pretended* degrees of Illumination, is groundleſs, and void of reaſon. But for what end good or bad he ſhould talk ſo ſolemnly about it, is hard to ſay, unleſs it were to make you ſuſpect ſome *depth* in his writings, where they are ſo *muddy*, that you cannot *ſee* to the *bottom.*

As for the third degree of Illumination, he promiſes to *explain it afterward*: But I ſhall be more kinde to the Reader, and let him know that this third degree is nothing leſs than that *new ſaving Light* which we examined his pretence to in the *Introduction*, and in which the work of Regeneration wholly or partly conſiſts; and ſo is none of the *Preparatory* works here intended by him. But becauſe he has reſerved this for another ſeaſon, I ſhall now proceed to the *ſecond Work*, which he ſays is *Preparatory* to Converſion: And that is —— P. 195.

SECT. 4.

2. *Conviction of ſin*, in which there are *ſundry things included*, as he tells us, *viz.* 1. *A diſquieting ſenſe of the guilt of ſin*, i. e. a fear of God's threatnings denounced againſt the ſinner. 2. *Sor-* P. 194.

row

row for ſin committed, becauſe paſt and irrevocable, which, he ſays, *the Scripture calls the ſorrow of the world*, 2 Cor. 7. 10. But he ſays more than he can prove; *The ſorrow of the world*, which St. *Paul* there ſpeaks of, is oppoſed to *godly ſorrow* that worketh repentance: wherefore he that ſorrows for *ſin*, *becauſe it is paſt and irrevocable*, and has the opportunities of Repentance before him, may well be ſuppoſed to have this *godly ſorrow*; ſince his ſorrow implies, that if it were to do again, he would abſtain from ſin: but the *ſorrow of the World* is that which *worketh death*, as the Apoſtle tells us; and is not this ſorrow then a very proper preparative to Repentance?

Whereas he tells us, that *Divines call this* ſorrow *Legal*, we are not to take his word for it. But whoever ſays ſo, he is to blame: For if a man be firſt enlightened with the knowledge of the Goſpel, and is thereby convinced of his ſins, and then becomes ſorrowful for them, upon ſuch reaſons as the Goſpel hath diſcovered to him, (which he is ſuppoſed to underſtand) let the Doctor and his *Divines* tell us why this ſorrow ſhould not be *called* Chriſtian and *Evangelical*. 3. *Humiliation for ſin*, which conſiſts in *Confeſſion, Praying, Faſting, and the like*; and *this* again *is the true nature of legal Humiliation*, though nothing is more plain, than that theſe are Goſpel-duties. He whoſe ſorrow *works in the outward acts* of theſe things, as our Author ſpeaks, does that which becomes a Chriſtian, becauſe he does what the Goſpel requires of him; and there is no reaſon why you ſhould perplex him with calling his Humiliation *Legal*, which you

uſe

uſe to oppoſe to *Evangelical.* 4. *Unleſs by theſe things the Soul be ſwallowed up by deſpair, it cannot be*, ſaith he, *but that it will be filled with thoughts, deſires, enquiries, and contrivances, about Deliverance.* Than which ſaying I know not what can be more abſurd: For how ſhould *Confeſſion, Faſting*, and *Prayer*, endanger the bringing of any man into deſpair? Theſe things do evidently ſhow that he hath hopes of recovering himſelf, otherwiſe why ſhould he uſe ſuch means as theſe in order to it? and certainly the uſe of *proper means* is not a way to make a man deſpair of the *end.*

But whereas he pretends, that if the Soul be not given up to deſpair, *it will be filled with thoughts, enquiries, and contrivances, about Deliverance*; this is very unreaſonable: for the *contrivance* or *enquiry* muſt be, either concerning the *means* by which *Gods Anger* may be *pacified*, and the ſinners Repentance *accepted*; but this *God* hath contrived for him already, by giving his onely Son to be a *Sacrifice* for us; and *this* the ſinner very well knows, becauſe he is ſuppoſed to *underſtand* and *believe* the Goſpel. Or the enquiry muſt be, upon what *conditions* he ſhall gain remiſſion of ſins, through the Sacrifice of *Chriſts* death: But this enquiry may be ſpared, becauſe he is *enlightned enough* to know that *Faith* and *ſincere Obedience* are required of him in order to that end. Or, Laſtly, his enquiry muſt be, what *means* he ſhould uſe in order to his own *Reformation*; and I know no better than thoſe which he is ſuppoſed to uſe already, *viz. Confeſſion, Faſting*, and *Prayer*; to which the Doctor, if he had pleaſed, might have added all

all the other ways that are proper to ſecure a man againſt ſin, and then have put him upon contrivances and enquiries about Deliverance, as reaſonably as he hath done it now; when indeed there is no reaſon why a man ſo *enlightened* as we ſuppoſe the convinced ſinner to be, ſhould be put to *enquire* after the way of Deliverance, becauſe he muſt needs know it already; and that which now remains for him to do, is to *uſe it.*

SECT. 5.

His third Preparatory work, is Reformation. *Often-times*, ſaith he, *a great reformation of Life and change in Affections, doth enſue hereon.* If this *great Reformation* and *Change* be univerſal, 'tis not *preparatory* to Regeneration, but 'tis the *ſtate* of Regeneration it ſelf. Such is that Reformation which is expreſſed in 2 *Pet.* 2. 20. a place cited by himſelf to ſhew his meaning. None but the Regenerate have *eſcaped the pollutions of the world*, or can be ſaid to *overcome*, as they are ſuppoſed once to have done, whom St. *Peter* there ſpeaks of: But the Doctor is of another minde; for according to him, this *work in the conjunction of all its parts may have its utmoſt improvement*, and yet be no more than a *preparatory* work: wherefore *Reformation* in its *utmoſt improvement*, may be no more than ſo. But that he is miſtaken in this point, is, I think, proved in the *Chapter* of Regeneration. Now that which he thinks is not *wanting* to make a man Regenerate, belongs to the *ſecond* enquiry.

SECT.

SECT. 6.

Having thus ſhewn, according to our Authors opinion, what the preparatory *works themſelves* are, I ſhall conſider,

2. What he ſaith of them *with Reference* to Regeneration; which (as far as his rambling way will permit) may be reduced to two Heads: 1. Wherein they fall ſhort of Regeneration. 2. What uſe they are of towards the cauſing of Regeneration.

He ſeems to propound the *former* ſubject of enquiry, where he acknowledges that the forementioned *Work oftentimes maketh a great appearance and reſemblance of Regeneration it ſelf*; telling us, that *if men proceed no further, they will periſh, and that eternally*: *Therefore*, ſays he, *I ſhall give ſome few inſtances of what this work in the conjunction of all its parts, and the utmoſt improvement of it, cannot effect; whereby men may make a true judgement how things ſtand in their own Souls in reſpect unto it.* P. 199.

Now by that Phraſe, *it cannot effect*, either he means *improperly*, that it cannot *conſtitute*, or *make up* that which he is about to ſpeak of; and then his meaning is, that the *preparatory work* is not *Regeneration* it ſelf: Or elſe he underſtands the phraſe in its proper ſence; and then he intends to *inſtance* in ſome *effects* which *always* proceed from *Regeneration*, but *never* from the *bare preparatory work*. Again, if the *former* be his mea-

ning, then his Inſtances are of thoſe things in which Regeneration it ſelf *conſiſts*: If the *latter*, then his Inſtances are of the *certain ſignes* and *marks* of a regenerate eſtate. And the truth is, by the Inſtances themſelves, you will be enclined to think ſometimes that he means the *one*, and ſometimes the *other*. Now whoever undertakes to help others to *diſtinguiſh*, eſpecially in matters of this moment, ought to ſpeak very *clearly* and *diſtinctly* himſelf: For thoſe *marks* of *difference* which are hard to be underſtood, though they be *true*, yet they are *not eaſie* to be *uſed*; but then the Doctor knows on the other ſide, that if they be *falſe*, they are as *hard* to be *confuted*. However, ſince his *Inſtances* do in my judgment contain ſome things that may ſtumble a ſincere Chriſtian, I ſhall venture to examine them.

1. *It may be obſerved*, ſaith he, *that we have placed all the effects of this Work in the Minde, Conſcience, Affections, and Converſation. Hence it follows, notwithſtanding all that is, or may be ſpoken of it, that the Will is neither really changed, nor internally renewed by it.* That is, ſo long as a man is in the ſtate of Preparation *onely*, ſo long he is unregenerate; for Regeneration conſiſts in the *change* of the *Will*. If notwithſtanding all that preparation which the Doctor has deſcribed, *the Bent and Inclination of the Will it ſelf is to ſin, and evil always and continually*, as he ſaith it is; they have, as yet, left the Soul as bad, in effect, as they found it: But I ſee no reaſon for his ſuppoſition, ſince a *great change* in the *Affections*, and a great reformation of the Life, do imply that the *Will* is in part *renewed*, and not ſo much *bent* and *inclined* to ſin, as it was before. But

now

now if you are reſolved to mean by your Preparatory Work, a Work that ſhall have no manner of Influence upon the Will; then you do well to ſay, that *notwithſtanding all that is, or may be ſpoken of it*, the *Will* ſhall not be made one jot the better by it. Onely you are to have a great care, not to put any thing amongſt your *Preparatory Works*, which muſt certainly operate upon the *Will*, and make it *better*; *notwithſtanding all that is or may be ſpoken* by you *againſt it.*

2. *This Work*, as we are told, *proceeds not ſo far as to give the Minde delight, complacency, and ſatisfaction, in the lively Spiritual Nature, and excellencies of the things revealed unto it.* If the Doctor means, that his *prepared* ſinner cannot be well-pleaſed with the knowledge of Gods Will, by *Jeſus Chriſt*; ſure he forgot, that under the head of Illumination, he allows him to *receive the Word with joy*, Luke 18. 13. But this is not his meaning. *The true nature*, ſays he, *of ſaving Illumination conſiſts in this, that it gives the Minde ſuch a direct intuitive inſight and proſpect into ſpiritual things, as that in their own ſpiritual nature, they ſute, pleaſe, and ſatisfie it. This the Work we have inſiſted on, cannot reach unto.* Now a man that deſires to underſtand the ſtate of his Soul towards God, would be glad to know what this *direct intuitive inſight and proſpect*, &c. means: for it needs explaining as much as any thing that Mother *Juliana*, or any of the Canting Brothers and Siſters of the *Roman* Church, ever ſaid. Therefore look but a little farther, and you ſhall ſee, that by this *Inſight*, &c. he underſtands our being pleaſed with ſpiritual things, without any regard to our own ſalvation. For, ſays he, *the*

Minde thus wrought upon, may finde an *excellency in them, with reſpect unto ſome benefit or advantage which is to be attain'd by means thereof,* and *may like it well in its effects, as a way of Mercy and Salvation.* But this Work *will not give ſuch a ſpiritual inſight into the Myſtery of Gods Grace, by Jeſus Chriſt, called his Glory ſhining in the face of Chriſt.* So that for this occaſion, the *ſpiritual* nature of the Goſpel is *one* thing, and the *ſaving* nature of it *another*; though hitherto *ſaving* and *ſpiritual*, *ſpiritually* and *ſavingly*, have been taken for one another all-along in his Book. But now, it ſeems, to *like* the Goſpel, becauſe it is *a way of Mercy and Salvation*, is *not* to *like* it for its *ſpiritual* nature: Doubtleſs therefore St. *Simeon* wanted a *direct intuitive inſight and proſpect* into the Goſpel, when he broke out into vehement expreſſions of joy, for nothing elſe, but that his *eyes had ſeen the Salvation of God.* Was it not pity that ſomebody did not take him down, with ſaying, that this was not to *admire the Myſtery of Gods Grace*, to *delight in it*, and *approve it*, *and finde ſpiritual ſolace with refreſhment in it, for what it is in it ſelf*, as our Author tells us, but onely *to like it well in its effects, as it is a way of Mercy and Salvation?* I would know of the Doctor whether the *Face of Jeſus Chriſt*, i. e. the Revelations which he hath made to us of Gods Will, do not in the firſt place reflect the *Glory of Gods Goodneſs and Mercy* upon our eyes; and therefore if it be not abſurd to oppoſe our delighting in the Goſpel, becauſe 'tis *a way of Salvation*, to our knowledge of the *Glory of God* by the *Face of Jeſus Chriſt.* But *theſe men* will not allow us to have any true love to Chriſt and the Goſpel, unleſs we ſet aſide the conſideration of all benefits

that

that we either have received, or do further expect from him; as you have been told in another Diſcourſe more at large. And ſo much for that *mark* of Grace which he calls an *Intuitive inſight and proſpect*, &c. *Knowledge of Jeſus Chriſt*, p. 413, *&c.*

3. He ſaith this Preparatory Work doth not *purge the Conſcience from dead works, that we ſhould ſerve the living God*, Heb. 9. 14. Now by *purging the Conſcience*, &c. it is plain, that the Apoſtle means, making expiation for all ſins, which could onely be done by the ſacrifice of *Chriſt*'s death; not *by the bloud of Bulls and Goats*, which *ſanctified onely to the purifying of the fleſh*, v. 13. *i. e.* to the expiation of external pollutions onely. Therefore I grant that the *preparations* to Regeneration, cannot *purge the conſcience from dead works*, if you take thoſe words in the Apoſtles ſence. But neither can *Regeneration* it ſelf do it, nor is there any need why it ſhould, ſeeing if we be regenerate, and *ſerve the living God*, the ſacrifice of *Chriſt*'s death will be available in our behalf for that end. But now by *purging the Conſcience*, the Doctor does at laſt underſtand that change which is made in the Minde, by its hating of ſin (which ſence I acknowledge the words themſelves will bear, though they are not ſo to be underſtood in the place cited by him.) Wherefore the firſt inſtance of what his Preparatory Work cannot effect, *viz.* the turning of the Will againſt ſin, is co-incident with this, of working *an abhorrency of ſin* in the Conſcience: Onely, he has ſome peculiar abſurdities under this, as when he makes this purging of the Conſcience, which conſiſts in hating and forſaking ſin, to be an effect of *applying Chriſts bloud to our Souls by faith*, and

yet preſently after he ſuppoſes, that there muſt be an *Abhorrency of ſin for it ſelf, to direct the Soul continually to an application to the blood of Chriſt, for the cleanſing of it ſelf.* But to note all his miſtakes, would be endleſs.

4. He ſays this Work doth not, 1. *Fix the affections, but true Grace fixeth the affections on ſpiritual things.* 2. *It doth not fill them, but ſaving Grace fills up the affections with ſpiritual things.* As for *fixing the affections*, he oppoſeth it to the *inſtability* of ſpiritual affections, as to *their very Being* (as his phraſe is) and as *to their Degrees.* If the affections are never *fixed* till 'tis impoſſible to take them off, then by this mark a man can never know that he has true Grace, till he knows himſelf paſt all danger of backſliding. Again, if they are never fixed, where there is an *inequality, and inſtability of degrees*, where they are *ſometimes hot, and ſometimes cold, ſometimes up, and ſometimes down*; he forgot himſelf in another place, where he flatters his believers, that they may have ſa-
P. 353. ving Grace, though *they are dead and cold in duties, backward in good works, careleſs of their hearts and thoughts, and addicted to the world.* As for *filling the affections with ſpiritual things*, he oppoſeth it to the remaining of *diſorderly affections* in the Minde. But that the *enlightned, convinced,* and *reformed* ſinners *affections* are not thus *fixed* and *filled*, as he would have them, he does not offer one ſyllable of proof, but expects we ſhould take it all upon his bare word.

Laſtly, he tells us, that the *Reformation* which he ſpake of, will be ſubject *to a threefold Defect*: As, 1. *It will conſiſt with, and allow of raging and reign-*

reigning ſins of Ignorance; which is ſomewhat ſtrange, if it be conſidered, that this reformed man's minde is *illuminated by an eſpecial work of the Holy Ghoſt*, as the Doctor himſelf ſuppoſes, and that he allows him the *utmoſt improvement* too, of this Illumination. I cannot comprehend how ſuch Illumination, and knowledge in the Goſpel, ſhould *conſiſt with raging and reigning ſins of Ignorance*. But he ſhews how it may, by this Inſtance: *So it left perſecution in* Paul *before his converſion*. As if St. *Paul* was a perſecutor after he was enlightned, and *knew* the Goſpel to be *the way of Righteouſneſs*. This man talks at random, and cares not what he ſays. 2. *Its Reformation is ſeldom univerſal, as to all known ſins, unleſs it be for a ſeaſon, whilſt the Soul is under a flagrant purſuit of Self-Righteouſneſs*. But then I hope *ſometimes* it may be *univerſal*, and not for a *ſeaſon onely*. Now he was obliged to ſhew us thoſe defects of the Preparatory Work, which always happen. But if this Reformation be not of *ſome* ſins onely, but of *all* that are known, and that not *for a ſeaſon* onely, but *continually*: I would know what harm there is in a *flagrant purſuit of Self-Righteouſneſs*; for if he means by it, that the ſinner *hopes* to be juſtified for the *merit* of his Works, he doth not ſuppoſe him to be enlightned, as he has great reaſon to be. But ſetting that hope aſide, *A flagrant purſuit of Self-Righteouſneſs*, i. e. of *Perſonal* Righteouſneſs, is a very good thing; and the more *flagrant* it is, the better it is. 3. *The converſation of perſons who live and abide under the power of this Work onely, is aſſuredly fading and decaying*. For which the Doctor can give us no other reaſon, I believe, but his ſaying, that *aſſuredly* it is ſo. For why may not

this good Converſation which the ſinner hath begun, be continued, and grow dayly to greater perfection? The reaſons why it *may*, are plain, *viz.* becauſe the ſame motives upon which this good Converſation was begun, do ſtill remain, and they are the promiſes and threatnings of the Goſpel, the death of *Chriſt*, and the like, which the ſinner is *enlightned* with the knowledge of: Beſides, *Experience* adds a greater ſenſe of the power of theſe conſiderations. Again, the ſame Divine Help, that of the *eſpecial Power of the Holy Ghoſt*, remains too; nay, and is augmented, if we may believe the promiſe of *Chriſt*, that *to him that hath*, i. e. that improveth, *it ſhall be given.* Finally, the ſame means of *Faſting*, and *Prayer*, which he uſed at firſt, may be uſed ſtill; and by *uſe* they grow more eaſie and habitual. Now why theſe cauſes ſtill abiding, and growing ſtronger, *cannot* maintain thoſe effects in a man, which they have already produced in him, I deſire the Doctor at his leiſure to inform me.

This is his Judgment concerning the difference between Regeneration, and the Preparations thereunto, *viz.* that in the latter the *Will* is not turned from ſin to God, the *Affections* are not placed on heavenly things, the Life is not univerſaly *reformed:* And that the prepared ſinner falls ſhort of the Regenerate in theſe reſpects. So that according to our Author in this place, the forementioned change in the Will, Affections, and Life, is either Regeneration it ſelf, or at leaſt the proper effect, and *ſigne* of Regeneration. Which of them he means, I ſhall not trouble my ſelf to enquire, becauſe in a different ſence they are both true; thoſe Effects being *Regeneration*

it

it ſelf, as that ſignifies a *State*, and the *ſigne of Regeneration*; as that ſignifies the *Operation* of the Holy Spirit, whereby they are *cauſed*. But if theſe effects are contained under thoſe works which he ſuppoſeth *Preparatory* to Regeneration, then has he made that to be *Preparatory* thereunto, which is the *thing* it ſelf; and by conſequence, *his* marks of difference may happen to *diſtract*, inſtead of *guiding* thoſe that uſe them.

SECT. 7.

I come in the next place to enquire of what *Uſe* theſe *Preparatory Works* are, according to him, and how far they *contribute* towards the cauſing of Regeneration. And this is an Enquiry of very great moment, becauſe a mans encouragement to endeavour after thoſe *diſpoſitions* which are means of Regeneration, does very much depend upon it.

He allows them, as we have already ſeen, to make the Soul *fit* for the *receiving* of Regeneration; but he denies that *all* do receive it who are *fit* ſo to do. Wherefore in the firſt place, he does not allow that they are *Means* by which Regeneration may *certainly* be obtain'd. Therefore the next Enquiry would be, why they are *ſometimes* fruitleſs; and his Anſwer in *general* is, That it *comes not to paſs, but by our own ſin:* which Anſwer I ſhould like very well, if it were reaſonable to ſuppoſe a man *fit* to receive the Grace of Regeneration, and that it is yet *his own fault* for which that Grace is denied to him; for if the *unfitneſs* does always ariſe from ſome *fault* of our P. 196.

our own, then if a man be *fit*,'tis not through his fault that Regeneration is not beſtowed on him. Therefore neither am I ſatisfied by thoſe *particular* Reaſons contained under this General one, upon which as the Doctor pretends *it commonly falls out*, that the preparations *are loſt, as unto any ſpiritual advantage.* In brief, they are theſe: 1. That *ſome are no way careful or wiſe, to improve this Light and Conviction unto the end whereto they tend, which is to take them off from their ſelf-confidence, and to direct them unto Chriſt.* The *end* to which they tend, is *Regeneration*; therefore he ſeems to make *Regeneration*, and *going to Chriſt*, all one; and then he ſhould have made this *care and wiſdom* in looking at the *end*, one of his preparatives. But if he means by going to *Chriſt*, ſeeking and truſting to the Divine Grace, then again that which hinders their Regeneration, is their not being *prepared* enough, according to the Doctor's own way; ſince they are not *illuminated* with the knowledge of ſo plain a point in Chriſtianity, as that the Grace of *Chriſt* is neceſſary to Regeneration. 2. *In ſome they are overborn by the power and violence of their luſts, the love of ſin, and the efficacy of temptation.* If Regeneration (as the truth is) does in great part conſiſt in overcoming the world and our luſts, then in effect he onely tells us that ſome of the prepared are not *Regenerate*, becauſe they are not *Regenerate.* But if Reformation of life and Affections, be onely a preparatory Work to Regeneration, as the Doctor ſeems to make it; then theſe *ſome* are not Regenerate, becauſe they are not *prepared*, i. e. *reformed* enough, ſo as *to overbear the power and violence of their luſts.* 3. *Some reſt in theſe things, as though they comprized the whole*

Work

Work of God towards them. If this be a true reaſon, then they are not regenerated, becauſe they are not prepared, *i. e. enlightned* enough, to know the difference between the *Means* and the *End.*

So that the onely reaſon he has yet given, why they who are *prepared* to the *utmoſt*, may yet never be *regenerated*, is in effect this, becauſe they are *not* prepared to the utmoſt.

Surely, whoever comes to the reading of a Diſcourſe concerning the Preparatories to Regeneration, would hope to meet with an account of thoſe Means by which a regenerate State may certainly be attain'd. Wherefore, after you have told him what *all your Preparatory Works* are, and withal that they may be *fruitleſs*, he would expect you ſhould tell him ſomething more clearly than you have done, what is yet wanting to make them *effectual.* When a man is by the Grace of God *enlightned* with the knowledge of the Goſpel, and *convinced* of his vile courſes, and does actually *forſake* them, and *faſts* and *prays*, which is the way of obtaining further Grace from God: If yet you tell him that this is *neither* the *ſtate* of Regeneration, *nor* the *certain way* of arriving to it; will he not be ready to ask what *remains* to be done, to make it *certain?* And if you conceal it from him, may he not juſtly queſtion whether you believe there is any *certain* way at all?

If the *advantage of the Souls of men* were ſo much your care, as you would make us think when you come to reproach your Adverſaries in the cloſe of this *Chapter*, ſurely you ſhould have P. 202. ſaid

ſaid ſomething to *extricate them from ſo great a perplexity* as this; for it deſerves your skill as much as any of thoſe which your *wiſe and experienced Maſters of the Aſſemblies*, are ſo good at untying as you pretend. You ought to have found leiſure for the diſcloſing of this ſecret, out of mere tenderneſs to them, who would ask *what they muſt do to be ſaved*, or which at laſt comes all to one, *to be regenerated*, though you had been forced to ſtraiten your time of throwing dirt upon us, as you do upon every occaſion.

If you *have not* told us *all* that, in your judgment, muſt be done by us in order to Regeneration, you have not been true to your undertaking: If you *have*, why do you tell us that all may be to no purpoſe? Certainly they that intend to treat of theſe Preparations, ſhould intend to excite men to the *uſe* of them at laſt. But did ever any man go about to recommend the uſe of Means, by diſparaging them, and ſhewing their inſufficiency? Had you ſaid, that although they are of themſelves too weak to ſave, yet through the power of his *Grace*, whoſe bleſſing is never abſent from the endeavours of the humble, they will ſurely prevail, this had been a very intelligible encouragement to the uſe of them: But I cannot finde any one paſſage that ſavours of this ſence, in all your *Chapter*, nor in all your *Book*.

But whoever underſtands what principles you endeavour to defend in this Book, may eaſily diſcern what anſwer you muſt make, if you make any at all, when you are preſt to ſay, *What further muſt be done* in order to Regeneration. For you

you muſt anſwer, that *there is ſtill wanting that irreſiſtible Operation of the Holy Spirit upon the minds of men, without which they cannot be regenerated.* Which is a very *good* Anſwer, if it were a *true* one; for it is clear, that the Preparatives which do not work *irreſiſtibly*, cannot *effect* that which nothing leſs than an *irreſiſtible* power can effect.

But there was good reaſon why this was not fit to be ſaid here, becauſe if it had, the meaneſt of your Readers might eaſily have obſerved how ill your principles hang together: for if they had been told, that after the *utmoſt improvement* of thoſe *Preparations* which you your ſelf require, Regeneration can never be effected but by an irreſiſtible force; muſt they not ſee that you have left your ſelf no kinde of Motive to perſwade an underſtanding man to uſe *them?* For then,

1. You could not truly ſay, that they are *in themſelves neceſſary* to Converſion, and that becauſe the irreſiſtible act is of *it ſelf* ſufficient without them.

2. You could not truly ſay, that *in themſelves* they are at leaſt *profitable* to Converſion, and that becauſe the obſtinacy of the moſt *unprepared* minde will be born down by the Torrent of irreſiſtible Power, as infallibly and as eaſily as the more *flexible* and hopeful ſinner would yield to it, and go along with it.

3. Neither muſt you ſay, that however they are by Gods appointment, the Conditions *upon which he will beſtow* the favour of the irreſiſtible act:

act: For you have excluded your ſelf from this pretence, by affirming that *all things* preparatory may be wrought in the minds of men, and yet Regeneration never follow; for this is to ſay, that where they are *all* together, irreſiſtible Grace may, for all that, be *never* granted: For when that comes, Regeneration follows with a witneſs. Wherefore inſtead of giving thoſe three unlikely
P. 196. reaſons why *it commonly falls out*, as you ſay, that *many* who are *prepared* are never *converted*; you ſhould have been ſo honeſt as to have given the reaſon you had in your minde, *viz.* that it *falls out* ſo, becauſe God is not pleaſed to adde the irreſiſtible act: and that becauſe *he always had a minde to damn 'em*; which is the great point you would gain, though you are loath to ſpeak it out.

4. Neither could you ſay, that at leaſt they are conditions *without which no man ſhall* enjoy the favour of irreſiſtible Grace, ſince you tell us,
P. 193. that *ſometimes God goeth out of his way as it were to meet with* an unprepared ſinner, and *to bring him home to himſelf.* Wherefore,

5. All that remains to be ſaid by way of Motive, to excite any man to be *prepared*, is this; that 'tis profitable ſo to be, becauſe God will not *ordinarily* regenerate any but ſuch: But whether this can have any power to perſwade, according to your Principles, I will leave you your ſelf to judge, after you have conſidered, 1. That they cannot be *profitable* to your *Elect*, who, as you tell us, were *the matter deſigned of God for the work of Regeneration to be wrought upon*; ſeeing the neceſſity of their being regenerated in time, depends upon an *Abſolute Decree*, and an *Irreſiſtible Power:*

Power: And then 'tis equally well with them, whether *God keeps in his way*, or *goeth, as it were, out of his way*, to regenerate them. But, 2. That to all the reſt, *viz.* the *Non-elect*, they are ſo far from being *profitable*, that they are *miſchievous* and *hurtful* to them; and that not onely becauſe, as you ſay, *they become a means of their preſent ſecurity and future deſtruction*, who *attain no more* (and more is not poſſible to be attain'd by them) but becauſe the *rejection* of theſe Means, as you call it, (you mean, I ſuppoſe, their not being improv'd to Regeneration) is a *great aggravation of the ſin and miſery of them in whom they are wrought.* P. 199. P. 202.

From all this it ſeems to follow clearly, that of the two it is more adviſable to be *unprepared*, than to be *prepared:* for if a man *be deſign'd* for the work of Regeneration, the irreſiſtible act will *bring him home* in good time, though *God goeth, as it were, out of his way to meet him.* If he be *not* deſigned to it, all his Preparations can ſerve to no other end than to *aggravate his ſin and miſery.*

And it is more than probable, that you think ſo too, ſince you durſt not plainly mention the neceſſity of irreſiſtible Grace to the *act* of Converſion, where you ſpeak of the *Preparatives* to it: For there was great reaſon why you ſhould have done ſo; and ſo I believe you would have done, had you not been ſenſible that your Doctrines cannot bear the preſence of one another. It is a dangerous thing for you to have what you ſay in ſeveral places laid together. And 'tis eaſie for any one that reads you with care, to obſerve

at

at what convenient diſtances (which is eaſie in a great Book) you have diſpoſed your inconſiſtent Pretences and Sayings, that if a man be either weary or forgetful, you may eſcape. But this is not to write like an *honeſt man*, and a *good Chriſtian.*

'Tis in vain, I fear, to ſhew you the ill conſequences of your darling-opinions; for it ſeems plain enough to me, that you are ſenſible of them already. And that this is no weak conjecture of mine, I ſhall endeavour to convince you by another inſtance in this very *Chapter*, *viz.* where you propound this Objection: That *whereas all theſe things may be wrought in the minds of men, and yet they may come ſhort of the ſaving Grace of God, how can the Holy Spirit be thought to be the Author of ſuch a Work?*

P. 198.

Now in anſwer to this Objection, it ſeems, you found it needful to ſay, that which directly overthrows your Opinion, That Converſion cannot be effected but by an irreſiſtible Operation. For this you ſay, *They* who are *prepared* and not converted, *do not ſincerely improve what they have received; and faint, not merely for want of ſtrength to proceed, but by a free act of their own wills, they refuſe the Grace which is further tendred to them in the Goſpel.* Now from hence it follows by immediate conſequence, that they might have proceeded to Converſion, who yet wanted that irreſiſtible Grace which you ſay *muſt* be the immediate cauſe of Converſion. This Paſſage of yours does ſo openly and broadly contradict the great Deſigne of your Book, that you were jealous leſt your Reader ſhould think you had forgotten

gotten your ſelf; and therefore you ſet a good face upon the matter, and made a ſhew of aſſerting your Opinion preſently after; but you durſt not be ſo bold as to aſſert it plainly and honeſtly. For this is all you ſay: *This Will and its actual reſiſtency unto the Work of the Spirit, God is pleaſed in ſome to take away: It is therefore of ſoveraign Grace, when and where 'tis removed.* Now this is not very pertinent; for the Queſtion was, why *ſome* are not regenerated though they are prepared by the Work of the Spirit; and you give a reaſon why *others* are regenerated. But neither do you expreſs your opinion in this matter fully and clearly: for, 1. Againſt the irreſiſtible Work of the Spirit, there can be *no actual Reſiſtency.* 2. You do not tell us whether God is pleaſed to take away this Reſiſtency in *ſome* by an *irreſiſtible* Work, or *not.* 3. If you mean the former, yet it does not follow that this act of *ſoveraign Grace* is ſo neceſſary to *all*, that Converſion cannot be without it. But that, as you know, is your *Hypotheſis.*

There is another glance at your Opinion preſently after, which I ſhall have occaſion preſently to take notice of. But in the mean time, what can any indifferent and obſerving man that reads theſe Paſſages of your Book, think of you, but that you lay Deſignes to impoſe upon your credulous Readers; while you are ſo ſenſible of your own Contradictions, that you dare neither *wholly* to *conceal* them, on the one hand, nor to bring them into *open light*, on the other; but are forced to diſguiſe them with *obſcure* and *imperfect* Sayings, as your manner is? If Truth were on your ſide, you *needed not* to fear the brighteſt day;

and there are few who will believe that a man of your *confidence* would fear it, were you not *ſenſible* that the Truth is againſt you.

And thus much concerning our Author's Opinion of the Preparatory Works *themſelves*; which was to be the matter of the *ſecond* General Enquiry.

SECT. 8.

Thirdly, That which he ſaith concerning the manner of the Holy Spirits Operation in preparing the Unregenerate, you have in his *laſt Anſwer* to the Objection now mentioned; *viz.* That the Holy Spirit, *in his whole Work, is a voluntary Agent; and no more is required to his Operations, that they may be ſuch as become him, but theſe two things: 1. That in themſelves they be good and holy. 2. That they be effectual as unto the ends whereto they are by him deſigned: for what he worketh in any of theſe things, effectually and infallibly accompliſheth the End aimed at; which is no more but that men be enlightned, convinced, humbled, and reformed, wherein he faileth not.* By which, you ſee, he aſcribes theſe Preparations to an *irreſiſtible* Work of the Spirit. I ſhall onely obſerve, by the way, that in theſe words 'tis *implied*, that where Regeneration does not follow the Preparations, there the *Spirit* did *not intend* that it ſhould follow: For if the Spirit had *aimed* at that, it had been wrought as *infallibly* as the Preparations were. But had this been plainly ſaid, his own Party, as bad as they are at making Conſequences, might well have queſtioned,

tioned, how it could conſiſt with the foregoing Reaſon why the *prepared* are ſometimes not converted, *viz.* becauſe *they refuſe the Grace which is further tendred to them in the Goſpel.*

But now two Chapters before, where the danger was leſs, he ſpeaks home to the buſineſs. *Whereas*, ſaith he, *ſome are ſaid to reſiſt the Holy Spirit, and ſo to fruſtrate his Work toward them, it is not becauſe they can do ſo abſolutely, but onely they can do ſo, as to ſome way, kinde, or degree of his Operations. Men may reſiſt ſome ſort or kinde of means, that he uſeth, as to ſome certain end or purpoſe, but they cannot reſiſt him as to his purpoſe, and* P. 165. *the end he aimeth at. Wherefore in any Work of his two things are to be conſidered: 1. What the means he maketh uſe of tend unto in their own nature: And, 2. What he intends by it. The firſt may be reſiſted and fruſtrated, but the latter cannot be ſo.* This is a very fair account why ſome are ſaid to reſiſt the Holy Spirit, which he undertook to give us the reaſon of; *viz.* becauſe no man ever did, or can reſiſt him: Not the *unprepared*, becauſe the Spirit *intended not* they ſhould be prepared; for if he had *intended* it, they had been prepared: Not the prepared who are *unconverted*, for the ſame reaſon, *viz.* becauſe their Converſion was never intended. For when all is done, he tells us plainly, that the *Means* may be reſiſted, ſo that what *they tend to of their own nature*, ſhall never be attain'd; but that which *the Spirit intendeth by them*, ſhall infallibly be accompliſht. For further ſatisfaction, he proceeds thus: *Sometimes in and by that word which in its own nature tends to the converſion of ſinners, he intendeth by it onely their hardning.* Now it is ſo

plain (according to theſe Principles) that theſe men do *not reſiſt* the Spirit, that they comply with him as fully as the *Regenerate* do. And this Saying of his muſt be underſtood of all perſons that miſcarry under the Goſpel, *viz.* that the Holy Spirit intended not they ſhould be the *better* for the *means* of Grace, but the *worſe*; ſeeing this he lays down for a Generall Rule without exception, that *whatever he intends in the uſe of any Means, he cannot be reſiſted in.* It is therefore abſurdly ſaid of the Doctor preſently after, that as to what *Means* tend to, *men may reſiſt the work of the Spirit, and reject his Counſel concerning themſelves.* For can that Work of the Spirit be reſiſted which is irreſiſtible? Or, can the counſel of the Spirit concerning any man be rejected? Can his purpoſe fail of being accompliſht? Did you not tell us, that whatever the *Spirit intends* by the uſe of *Means*, cannot be *fruſtrated?* Therefore if he intends that any man ſhall be hardned by the Word, as you ſuppoſe he does, the Spirit cannot be ſaid to *work* in order to that mans Converſion, nor can his Converſion be ſaid to be *the counſel of, the Spirit concerning* him; and therefore it is abſurd to ſay, that he does *reſiſt the Work of the Spirit, and reject his counſel.*

But ſay you, *When the Spirit will put forth his power in and by the Word to the creating of a new Heart in men, and the opening of the eyes of them that are blinde, he doth therein ſo take away the principle of Reſiſtance, that he is not, that he* CANNOT *be reſiſted.* To which if we adde what
P. 166. you ſay not long after, *That if he intends no more than their Conviction and Illumination, no more ſhall be*

be effected; then it is clear, that the reaſon why the prepared ſometimes are not converted is this, *viz.* becauſe their Converſion was impoſſible to be *effected* without that irreſiſtible power, which the Holy Spirit never intended them the benefit of.

Now this plain dealing had been dangerous in the Chapter concerning the Preparatory Works, where he tells us, that *they faint not merely for want of ſtrength to proceed:* For the Reader might then preſently call to mind, that they muſt neceſſarily faint for want of an Almighty ſtrength; which they neither have in themſelves, nor which the Spirit intended to uſe for them: *But by a free act of their own Will, they refuſe the Grace which is further tendred unto them in the Goſpel:* Which Grace is either *irreſiſtible*, and then it was *tendred* to them, but never *intended* for them; or *reſiſtible*, and 'tis no matter whether that be reſiſted or not.

Let us now lay theſe things together. We are told, 1. That *Preparation* is the effect of an *irreſiſtible* Work. 2. That when a man is prepared, *another irreſiſtible* Work is neceſſary to regenerate him. 3. That if he be not Regenerate, his Preparations ſerve onely to *aggravate* his ſin and miſery. Moreover, 4. That the Spirit *intended* they ſhould ſerve to that end, but not for his Converſion; for if the Spirit had intended otherwiſe, Converſion had followed. Finally, that the Spirit intendeth ſuch a man ſhall be hardned by *means* of the Word.

Now if all this be true, then it clearly follows, 1. That it was not onely the Counſel and Con-

trivance of *the Holy Spirit* to entrap this miſerable Creature, but that *He was fain to interpoſe his Almighty and irreſiſtible power to bring that Counſel to paſs*, and with *intention* thereby to aggravate the mans ſin and miſery: For had not this man been *prepared*, his ſin and miſery had been leſs, and the Holy Spirit was fain to prepare him by an irreſiſtible work, and this with intention, that he ſhould not be *converted*, but hardned. 2. (For this is not all) That for the bringing of this about, the Holy Spirit was to make Means work contrary to their *natural tendency*. For to harden the ſinner, and to aggravate his miſery, he made uſe of that good Word of God which promiſeth Life and Salvation to All that come to *Chriſt*, with Invitation of All ſo to do: which is to adde *Hypocriſie* to the extremity of *Cruelty*.

The Devil himſelf cannot be accuſed of doing thus much towards the remedileſs ruine of mens Souls: for though he intends as much evil to us as is here charged upon the Holy Spirit, yet he cannot be ſaid to effect it *irreſiſtibly*, nor to do it in *ſo deceitful a way*, though he be the *Great Deceiver*; for he is our known enemy, and can never make us believe that he would *have us to be ſaved*.

Good God! that men ſhould not tremble to ſpeak theſe *hard* things of *that* Holy Spirit *whereby we are ſealed to the day of Redemption*.

SECT. 9.

Thus have I ſhewn you what the Doctor ſaith are the *Works* Preparatory to Regeneration; and

and in what ſence he calls them *Preparatory*; and *how* they are effected by the Holy Spirit.

I now come to ſhew more diſtinctly, that his Doctrine concerning theſe things, is not onely *unprofitable*, but in its direct conſequences, *deſtructive of Godlineſs.*

(1.) What he ſaith concerning the two laſt Heads mentioned, cuts the ſinews of all endeavour after thoſe Qualifications, whereby, as he pretends, a man is prepared for Converſion, as I have in great part already ſhewn. For, 1. He makes them to be the effects of an irreſiſtible Work of the Spirit, without telling us that there is ſome way by which the Spirit *may be prevailed with* to exert his Almighty Power for the producing of theſe Qualifications in a mans minde. But he ſays very much to the contrary, and particularly, that they ſhall be, where the Spirit intendeth to work them; and where he intendeth it not, there they ſhall not be; and this is all. Now if they are diſpoſed *arbitrarily*, and effected *irreſiſtibly*, I deſire any man that underſtands common ſence, and ſpeaks with an intention to be underſtood, to tell me of what uſe any mans endeavours after them can be. But ſetting this quite aſide, 2. He makes theſe Preparations, where they are, altogether inſufficient to bring a man to a Regenerate State, without a new irreſiſtible Work, without which Regeneration can never be perfected, and which is ſometimes denied to the *moſt prepared* of all, while 'tis granted to ſome that are *not prepared at all.* So that the diſpoſal of *regenerating* Grace being as Arbitrary as that of *preparing* Grace, I do not ſee what can

reaſonably be ſaid to excite mens endeavours after the Preparatory Graces, were they never ſo eaſie to be gain'd; for when they are gain'd, a man is never the nearer being regenerated, if the irreſiſtible favour be not deſigned for him; and if it be, he is ſafe without them. Men may have all his *material* Preparations, as he calls them, and yet it ſhall be as impoſſible for them to be Regenerate, as 'tis for *dry wood* to flame (to uſe his own ſimilitude) till you put fire unto it; which if you do not, 'tis, I ſuppoſe, as ſecure from burning as the *greateſt Tree* in the Foreſt: which yet might be ſet on fire too, by that Almighty Power, which, as the Doctor thinks, does introduce the *Form* of Regeneration, and ſometimes regenerates the unprepared minde; when *God goeth, as it were, out of his way to bring home a ſinner to himſelf.*

Let our Author keep to his Principles and try whether he can offer a ſubſtantial reaſon, why any man ſhould be at the trouble of preparing himſelf for Converting Grace: And when he pretends to do ſo, if I cannot ſhew him either that his *Exhortation wants all motive*, or elſe that he *wanders from his Principles*, I ſhall confeſs my ſelf miſtaken in this Charge.

SECT. 10.

(2.) His Scheme of the *Preparatory Works* themſelves, tends to the diſquieting of mens minds with uſeleſs and unreaſonable Scruples; and likewiſe to the corrupting of their judgments about the State of Regeneration it ſelf.

1. That

1. That it tends to the diſquieting of mens mindes with unreaſonable doubts and Scruples, is plain from what he ſays about the *ſecond degree of Illumination*, which 'tis impoſſible for any man to know whether he hath it or not; and from his making *Conviction* of ſin, ſorrow for ſin, faſting and prayer, to be *legal Humiliations*, not ſhewing wherein *they* differ from *Evangelical*: By which he leaves the Penitent, that lights not upon a better Guide, under endleſs doubts, whether he hath yet humbled himſelf before God in a Goſpel-manner, after never ſo much *ſorrow*, *confeſſion*, &c. *See* p. 6, 7, 8. *above.*

But that which is worſt of all, is his putting the humbled ſinner upon thoughts, enquiries, and contrivances about Deliverance (which is one of the Preparatories by him aſſign'd) after all his knowledge of the minde of God concerning Salvation by *Chriſt*, and all his religious Endeavours to qualifie himſelf for God's pardon through *Chriſt*. For what is this but to ſend him in *queſt* after nothing, and either to weary him out with *endleſs* Enquiries, or to expoſe him to the cheats of his own *Fancy*, or the deluſions of the *Devil*, or of *falſe Prophets* that lie in wait for the Souls of men? For if after the ſinner knows what the promiſes of God are, which are ſealed by the Bloud of *Chriſt*, and what the conditions of thoſe promiſes are, he muſt yet be put upon enquiries and contrivances for Deliverance; it is then plain, that Deliverance is not to be had by the *Goſpel of Chriſt*, nor is the *belief* thereof, joyned with *Repentance* and *Obedience* for the future, ſufficient to ſettle a ſinners minde, and paci-

fie

ſie his Conſcience upon good grounds. This Perſwaſion being once imbibed, it is either impoſſible ſuch a man ſhould ever be ſatisfied at all, or if he be, that he muſt be groſly impoſed upon by *himſelf* or his *Guides*. He is betrayed into a neceſſity of perpetual fears and jealouſies, unleſs his minde be eaſed at laſt by the follies of *Fanaticiſm* and *Superſtition*.

And this is plainly the Artifice of the Doctor and his Companions, to maintain their Spiritual Empire over the Conſciences of men. They contrive ſenſeleſs and intricate Trains of Converſion, wherein they are to have the Arbitrary conduct and management of mens Souls: And to put the people upon a neceſſity of ſubmitting to ſo much of their methods, as they their *Maſters* pleaſe to preſcribe; they firſt teach them to quit the ſteady principles of the Goſpel, and to ſeek for Salvation and Deliverance ſome other way; as if all that the Goſpel has done for our direction in the way to Heaven, was to put us upon *Enquiries*, and then ſend us to *theſe men*, for ſatisfaction.

But how do they manage their peoples Conſciences, when they have brought 'em to this point of *enquiring after Deliverance?* They do by turns *amaze* them with *fears*, and *tranſport* them into *joys*, without any juſt reaſon for either; and when they have kept them long enough in this *Diſcipline*, and their Underſtandings are *tame* enough to ſubmit to any means of Deliverance that their *Keepers* ſhall propound to them; they are fit to be told, that they ſhall finde Deliverance in the *Perſon* of *Chriſt*; and they are bid

bid to *reſt*, and *rely*, and *rowl* upon *Chriſt* for Salvation, and to receive *a Chriſt* that hath done all for them, and left them nothing to do for their juſtification. And indeed they ſet their people ſuch vexatious methods of Converſion, that is, of *getting* into *Chriſt*, that by that time they have gone through with them, the *poor creatures* are made *ſenſeleſs* enough to believe any thing that ſhall be ſaid to them; and withall, they muſt needs think themſelves much obliged to their Teachers for delivering them at laſt, by ſuch an eaſie work of the Fancy, as to *rowl* upon the *Perſon* of *Chriſt*.

Now that it may appear I do not wrong *theſe men*, I ſhall here ſet down their *Manner* or Method of Converſion, as 'tis deſcribed by the Doctor in his third *Book* and ſixth *Chapter*; and then leave the Reader to judge whether it could be contrived by men that pretend to Learning, for any other purpoſe, but to inſult over the weakneſs of their *Proſelytes*.

(1.) He ſuppoſeth that a Religious temper may be wrought in *Children*; which *with the moſt wears off*. I have nothing to object againſt what he ſays under this Head, but that he ſeems to talk too ſlightly of good Education. The Word of God ſaith, *Train up a Childe in the way he ſhould go, and when he is old, he will not depart from it*. Which is not ſo to be underſtood, as if the Rule *could never fail*; but I think thus much at leaſt may be concluded from it, That a *wiſe* and religious Education of Children, is one of the moſt effectual means of Grace, and *ſeldom* fails. P. 254.

(2.) *God*

(2.) *God works upon men by his Spirit in outward means, to cauſe them to take ſome real and ſteady conſideration of him, their own diſtance from him, and obnoxiouſneſs to his Righteouſneſs on the account of ſin.* Here, as he ſaith, *God begins with them, and thereby to ſubduct them from under the abſolute power of the vanity of their mindes.* The ways of effecting this, are ſaid to be either *ſudden amazing Judgments upon others; or perſonal Afflictions; or remarkable Deliverances and Mercies; or an Obſervation of the Converſation of others; or the Word in the reading and preaching*
P. 296. *thereof:* That is, *by theſe and the like means doth God oftentimes put the wildneſs of corrupt Nature to a ſtand,* &c. And hence, *Prayers for Pardon, with Reſolutions of Amendment.* But *with many all this proves evanid and fading*; the firſt reaſon whereof is this, That *the darkneſs of their minds is,* yet, *uncured,* that is to ſay, not diſpell'd by *irreſiſtible Light*; for that he means, as I ſhall convince you in a fitter place: and if that be true, all the reſt of his Reaſons may well be ſpared.

(3.) *The Holy Spirit convinceth them of ſin*, as
P. 297. if they were not convinced of it before, when the Spirit cauſed them to apprehend *their obnoxiouſneſs to God upon the account of ſin.* Now the *nature* of Conviction *in General*, conſiſts, as he ſaith, 1. In *fixing the vain minde of a ſinner upon a due conſideration of ſin, its nature, tendency, and end, with his own concernment therein:* And, 2. In *fixing of a due ſence of ſin upon the ſecure minde of the ſinner, with ſuitable affections unto its apprehenſions.* The ſubject of the former Work, is *the Underſtanding, which is the active, noetical, or*

con-

contemplative power and faculty of the minde. The ſubject of the latter, is *the practical, paſſive, ſenſible part of the Minde, that is, the Conſcience and Affections.* Now it might have ſatisfied a plain man to have ſaid, that we muſt firſt *underſtand* that we are ſinners, and liable to God's angry Juſtice; and then, as there is great reaſon, be ſeriouſly *affected* with the apprehenſion of it. But then, not onely a pretty *Jingle* had been loſt, but withal, the matter had been ſo plain, that the Doctor's followers had ſtood in leſs *need* of *his* Judgment to *reſolve* them, when *the conſideration or ſenſe of ſin is fixed upon the Minde*, after *the Minde hath been fixed upon the ſenſe or conſideration of ſin.* Now *this Work* produceth *great Reſolutions of Amendment, and much Reformation of Life; all the power and efficacy* of which, may be loſt, becauſe *their luſts being onely checked and controuled, not ſubdued, they get new ſtrength by their reſtraint, and rebel with ſucceſs againſt Conviction*; and for other reaſons.

(4.) *In ſome the Holy Spirit is pleaſed to carry on this Work of Conviction towards a further bleſſed Iſſue*; and then, *firſt there will follow great and ſtrange conflicts between their Corruptions and Convictions.* But had we not theſe Conflicts before, when Conviction *controuled* Luſt, and Luſt *rebelled* againſt Conviction? But this is the Artifice of theſe Maſters; they give different names to the ſame things, and then they perſwade their people that the Work is carrying on further, when indeed it ſticks juſt where it was before. But that which is moſt admirable, is, that *theſe Conflicts* come to no more than this, That *the Law* P. 321. *coming with power and terrour on the Conſcience,*

re-

requires a relinquiſhment of all ſins, at the eternal peril of the Soul. Sin hereby is incited and provoked, and the Soul begins to ſee its diſability to conflict with that which before it thought abſolutely in its own power. And preſently after, *ſin riſing up in rebellion againſt the Law, diſcovers its own power, and the utter impotency of them in whom it is to conteſt with it, or deſtroy it.* Theſe are indeed very *ſtrange* Conflicts; but I can at no hand allow them to be *great* ones, where all the *Conflict* on *one* ſide, is to *ſee its diſability to conflict with the other.*

But theſe Convictions will produce, 1. *Some endeavours and promiſes of Amendment and Reformation of Life*; whereby I perceive the Work is going backward, inſtead of advancing forward; for they were *great Reſolutions of Amendment, and much Reformation of Life*, which the *other* Convictions produced; and that I ſuppoſe is ſomething more than *ſome endeavours and promiſes thereof.* Well, but, 2. *Theſe endeavours do ariſe unto great perplexities and diſtreſſes: For after a while the Soul of a ſinner is torn and divided between the Power of Corruption, and the Terrour of Conviction.*

So that *the fixing of the Minde on the conſideration of ſin*, and *of a due ſenſe of ſin on the Minde*, cauſeth the *checking of Corruption by Conviction*; and this produceth *great endeavours, and much Reformation*; and if the Work goes on any further, then all this will cauſe *great and ſtrange Conflicts between Corruption and Conviction*; and theſe Conflicts again produce *ſome Endeavours of Reformation*; and theſe Endeavours again produce great

great and ſtrange Conflicts, that is, under a new name of *perplexities and diſtreſſes, the Soul of a ſinner being torn and divided between the Power of Corruption, and the Terrour of Conviction.*

This *Teaſing*, according to him, falls out upon a double account: 1. *Upon ſome occaſional ſharpning of former Convictions*, &c. 2. *From the ſecret inſinuation of a principle of ſpiritual life and ſtrength into the Will, whoſe nature and power the Soul is yet unacquainted withal. This*, he ſaith, *being deſigned to rule and bear ſway, the Soul begins its Conflict effectually to eject ſin out of its Throne and Dominion.* But all this while I do not underſtand why the *new principle* of ſpiritual life might not have been ſuppoſed ſooner; for if the Doctor had pleaſed, it might have been brought in preſently after the *great and ſtrange Conflicts* that we had before; and then there had been ſome needleſs trouble ſaved. I would fain know what other reaſon he had to bring it in ſo late, beſides that of amuſing the people with ſuch a method of Converſion, as *doubles* at every turn, and goes *backward* and *forward*; which ſince 'tis impoſſible for them to *know* the meaning of, by themſelves, they are caſt upon a neceſſity of ſurrendring the abſolute *conduct* of their Souls in this matter to them who *pretend* to know it. This new *Conflict*, he ſaith, *fills the Minde with amazement, and in ſome brings them to the very door of deſpair. But in this tumult and diſtreſs of the Soul, God oftentimes quiets it by ſome ſuitable word of truth. ----In the midſt of this Storm and Diſorder he comes and ſays, Peace, and be ſtill.* And yet, for all this, he goes on and tells us, P. 303.

P. 304. *A ſecond thing which befals men under this Work of Conviction, is a dread and fear as to their eternal Condition, &c. afflictive perturbations of minde, with dread and terrour, conſternation, and humbling of their Souls thereon.* So that *Peace* and *Quiet* are out of doors; and once more enter *Tumult* and *Diſtreſs*, under the new names of *legal Sorrow, ſervile Fear*, &c. which he thus further explains.

P. 305. 1. *Conviction of ſin is ordinarily accompanied with a deep ſenſe and apprehenſion of the eternal danger which the Soul is liable unto, on the account of the guilt of Sin, whereof it is convinced*; which we had long ago, both when the Soul was ſuppoſed to have ſome ſteady conſideration of God, and its own obnoxiouſneſs to him, and when the *due ſenſe of Sin was faſtned upon the practical paſſible part of the Minde*; and at other times. 2. *This apprehenſion will ordinarily ingenerate diſquieting and perplexing affections in the mindes of men: As*, 1. *Sorrow and ſhame.* 2. *Fear of eternal wrath*; which we have had over and over. 3. *Perplexing, unſatisfactory enquiries after means and ways of deliverance out of this preſent diſtreſs, and from future miſery:* which is indeed (in this *Scheme*) new, but very unreaſonably brought
P. 306. in *here*, as I have ſhewn before. *Theſe things*, again, *will aſſuredly put the Soul on many duties, as Prayer for Deliverance, Abſtinence from Sin, Endeavours after a general Change of Life*; which comes in at every turn. And theſe things he makes to be the effects of *the Law, accompanied with a ſecret Vertue from God, called the Spirit of Bondage*; *which cauſeth a ſenſe of the curſe of it*

to

to take a deep impreſſion on the Soul, to fill it with fear and dread, yea, ſometimes with horrour and deſpair. So that although you might have gueſſed by that *new Principle of Spiritual life and ſtrength*, and that *peace and quiet* which he ſpake of before, that the ſinner was come under a *Goſpel-work*, yet you may be miſtaken; for, at preſent, you ſee he is but under the *Law*.

But would any one think, that after all this ado, he ſhould tell us, that, *No certain meaſure or degree of theſe Accidents or Conſequents of Conviction is to be preſcribed unto any as antecedaneouſly neceſſary to ſincere Converſion, and ſound Believing?* For let any man but himſelf ſay, if he has not preſcribed, not onely the *Accidents* and *Conſequents themſelves*, but the *Degrees* and *Meaſures* of them too, in many Caſes, when they are greater, when leſſer, in as peremptory terms as a man would expect. But ſuppoſe a man ſhould aſk you whether All theſe *Accidents* or *Conſequents*, as they beget one another in your *Scheme*, are *themſelves* neceſſary to be preſcribed, though the *degrees* of them be not; I doubt you would be hard put to it, to make an Anſwer. And truly that they themſelves are not to be preſcribed as neceſſary, follows plainly from your ſaying preſently, that the *two things* neceſſary, and thoſe, but *in General*, are, 1. *Such a Conviction of ſin, as that the Soul is ſatisfied that it is thereby obnoxious to the Curſe of the Law, and the Wrath of God.* 2. A *due apprehenſion and reſolved Judge-* P. 307.
ment, that there is no way within the compaſs of a mans own contrivance to finde out, or his ability to make uſe of, and walk in; nor any other way of Gods appointment or approbation, which will deliver

the Soul in and from the ſtate and Condition wherein it is, and that which it fears, but onely that which is propoſed in the Goſpel by Jeſus Chriſt.

Theſe are plainer Paſſages than you have uſed us to; and 'tis ſo great a rarity, that I thank you for it. But, if this be all the Conviction that is *antecedaneouſly neceſſary*, as you call it, to Converſion; do not, I beſeech you, reſerve to your ſelf a power of preſcribing thoſe *Accidents* and *Conſequents* of it, which you have deſcribed before, in their dependance one upon another. Oh! but

P. 306. *God is pleaſed to exerciſe a Prerogative and Sovereignty in this whole matter, and deals with the Souls of men in unſpeakable variety. Some he leads by the Gates of Death and Hell, unto Reſt in his Love; and the Paths of others he makes plain and eaſie to them.* And thus likewiſe you told us a

P. 304. little before, that *God carries ſome through ſtrong Convictions*, &c. *and perplexing Terrours; leading others gently and quietly*, &c. Which words of yours are capable of a very true and profitable ſence, as I ſhall ſhew in due place; but by the *Gates of Death and Hell*, I do not underſtand, as I think you do, thoſe your *Accidents* and *Conſequents* of Conviction which we have been looking over. Nay, I *grant* moſt willingly, that God *may*, and I *hope* aſſuredly that he *doth*, by the power of his Grace, bring many Souls to himſelf, whom you torment with your unreaſonable Methods; while you are to anſwer for the cauſeleſs agonies wherewith you trouble *them*, and the grievous ſtumbling-blocks you lay in the way of *others*. Now if by the *Gates of Hell* you mean your *Accidents* and *Conſequents*, 'tis boldly done of you to ſay that God leads men to Heaven by the

Gates

Gates of Hell, unleſs you could ſhew us plain warrant from Scripture for what you ſay. God does not lead men to Heaven by ſuch Trains and Methods of *Humane Invention*, as you and your Party preſcribe to thoſe melancholy Souls, whom you can eaſily fright, after they have entertain'd your *Principles*, into a ſubmiſſion to any of your *directions*. It is you, *you*, I ſay, that *exerciſe a Prerogative and Soveraignty*, which belongs not to you, *in this whole matter* that we have been conſidering. For if that Conviction which you at laſt tell us of, the meaning of which is plain, and the reaſon whereof is eaſie to be underſtood, be *All* the Conviction which is neceſſary to Converſion, and yet that other intricate Work of Conviction, wherein you have made ſo many *Doubles*, belongs to the Method of Converſion too, as you plainly make it; what elſe can we imagine you mean by theſe Riddles, but to reſerve to your ſelves the *Prerogative* of preſcribing what Method of Converſion you pleaſe, and by this means to ſute your Preſcriptions to the tempers of thoſe you have to deal with? which is the ſubtileſt way of *Lording it over mens Conſciences*, that has been yet invented; but which the *Jeſuites* began with before you; whoſe beſt Artifice to ſupport their Spiritual Soveraignty is this, that they have reſolutions in a readineſs, that ſhall hit all the ſeveral inclinations and tempers of the penitents that reſort to 'em for directions.

To conſider the *Tempers* of men, and then to follow them chiefly with thoſe Motives of the *Goſpel* (not excluding any of the reſt) which are moſt likely to make impreſſion on them, is a

part of true *Spiritual Wiſdom*, and a proper means of *bringing home Souls to God.* But to contrive *arbitrary Methods* of Converſion, and then to preſcribe them, as *occaſion* ſerves, is good for nothing but to *make men of all complexions faſt to a Party:* But if you make *God* to be the Author of thoſe *Fits* of Amazement and Horrour, which you ſometimes put the people into, by the *ſowerneſs* of *your* Principles, and the *intricacy* of *your* Rules; you ſeem to adde *impiety* to diſhoneſty, and to be as little afraid of trifling with the *Majeſty* of *the Holy Ghoſt*, as you are of dallying with the *Souls* of men.

To proceed; after this plain ſpeaking, ſo rare with our Author, he immediately confounds all
P. 307. again: For he tells us, that *where theſe things are, the Duty of a perſon ſo convinced is to enquire after, and to receive the Revelation of Jeſus Chriſt, and the Righteouſneſs of God in him:* Which direction comes in as wildly as is poſſible; for this very *perſon* was immediately before well reſolved in his judgment, that there is no way of *Deliverance but that which is propoſed in the Goſpel by Jeſus Chriſt:* Therefore ſurely he has already *enquired after the Revelation of Jeſus Chriſt*; unleſs the Doctor makes it to be one part of the Method of Converſion, for a man to be ſo ſenſeleſs as to reſolve upon he knows not what. *In order hereunto*, as the Doctor goes on, *he muſt firſt own the ſentence of the Law under which he ſuffereth, juſtifying God in his Righteouſneſs, and the Law in its Holineſs*; all which he has done already, if he was *duly convinced of ſin.* 2. He muſt not *haſtily believe every thing that will propoſe it ſelf to him, as a remedy or means of Relief:* And this, after he is re-

reſolved that no way is to be truſted, but that which is propoſed in the Goſpel. But above all he muſt take heed of hoping to eſcape by *Legal Righteouſneſs, which is ſought after in Amendment of life. For although the Law requires Amend-* P. 308. *ment of life, yet it propoſeth it not as that which will deliver any Soul from the guilt of ſin already contracted.* What ridiculous ſtuff is this! For his ſinner (who is already *enlightned*) muſt be in the *darkneſs* of thick Ignorance, if he goes to ſeek after *Legal Righteouſneſs in Amendment of life*; ſince *Legal Righteouſneſs* conſiſts in *unſinning Obedience.* The *Law* does not propoſe Amendment of life as a way to *eſcape*, i. e. the *Original Law* given to man in his Innocence: But the *Goſpel* does propoſe it (and that with *frequent* Commands and *vehement* Exhortations) as *a way to eſcape*, nay, as an indiſpenſible condition of being *delivered from Guilt*, by the ſacrifice of *Chriſt*'s death for us. Whatever this man ſays, Amendment of life ought to be *leaned on to this purpoſe*; for he that *confeſſeth* and *forſaketh* his ſins, ſhall *finde Mercy*: 'Tis ſo far from being *a broken Reed*, as this man calls it, that there is nothing can *ſupport Chriſtian* hope without it. But what *Guides* of Souls are theſe, who in their Directions towards Converſion, put in cautions againſt hoping *to eſcape by Amendment of life!* as if Repentance were not that *Door of Mercy* which our dear Lord has opened for us.

At laſt we are told, *It is the Duty of perſons in ſuch a condition, to beware of Entangling Temptations: As*, 1. *That they have not attained ſuch a degree of Sorrow for ſin, as is neceſſary unto them that are called to believe in Jeſus Chriſt.* This in-

deed comes in comfortably, after ſo many *Scenes* of Legal Sorrow as we have had; and yet all that I can gather from this general ſaying of yours, is this, That after you have held a ſinner as long as you thought good, under diſtracting Apprehenſions, Doubts, and *Amazements*, you know your Cue, when he is to be elevated with joys, that there is yet as little reaſon for, as there was for the *Turns* and *Returns* of his Griefs and Anxieties before. 2. *That thoſe who perſwade them to believe, know not how great ſinners they are, i. e.* They muſt not object their own ſins againſt themſelves, when your turn comes to bid them *believe in Chriſt*, your meaning of which, we ſhall ere long ſee. Had you ſaid, They ſhould not think themſelves too great ſinners to *amend*, and ſo be qualified for *Pardon*, you had ſpoken worthily of that *Grace* and *Mercy* of God, and withal of that Holineſs of the Divine Nature, which are ſo illuſtriouſly repreſented to us by the Goſpel. But to thruſt Amendment of life out of the conditions of *Pardon*, or *ways of eſcaping*, to make it a legal Righteouſneſs, to caution the ſinner againſt *hoping to eſcape* by it, and finally, to perſwade him that he is not too great a ſinner to *come to Chriſt*; What is this, but to make *Chriſt* a Sanctuary for thoſe incorrigible ſinners, who can never hope to eſcape upon the *Terms* of his *Goſpel*; and to betray your Followers (unleſs the Grace of God mightily prevails in them againſt the malignity of your Doctrines) into a neglect of true Repentance, as being not neceſſary to Juſtification by *Chriſt?*

Thus far has our Author brought on the Method of *Converſion*; which he now tells us, is *the*

In-

Ingenerating and acting of Faith in God by Jeſus Chriſt. And he ſaith, the laſt thing whereby this Work is compleated, as to the outward means of it, remains to be conſidered. And in the next Section I ſhall conſider it with him.

In the mean time it is not to be forgotten, that he has pretended to give us an Example of this manner of Converſion in the inſtance of St. *Auguſtine*, who becauſe he tells us by what fears he was wrought upon to reſolve upon the forſaking of his ſins, and what difficulties he found in his Converſion, and the like, is brought by this man to give teſtimony to all that wilde and intricate talk of his, which I have been examining.

I intend, with Gods bleſſing, to give an account of the Teſtimonies you bring out of the Fathers, in a Work by it ſelf. At preſent I ſhall onely ſay, That although it be neceſſary, in order to a thorough Converſion, that a man becomes ſenſible of his ſins, and ſorrowful for them, and afraid of Gods threatnings, (which is of good uſe after his Converſion, as well as before it) and that he believes Gods promiſes, and prays for his Grace, and reſolves upon Amendment, and that he does not give over becauſe of the Reluctancy of his evil Affections, and the Oppoſition of his evil Habits; which will at firſt, and for ſome time after, give him that diſquiet and trouble which St. *Auguſtine* found; yet all this will not juſtifie *thoſe Windings* and *Turnings* of theſe things backward and forward, by *which* you pretend to lead men to Converſion. Although alſo the Fears and Sorrows of men may be leſſened, *viz.* upon *ſome*

Amendment, and then increaſed beyond what they were at firſt, *viz.* upon a *Relapſe*; yet this is no warrant to you, when you are preſcribing the Method of Converſion, to make men fear and ſorrow by fits, over and over again, and then to put them upon Enquiries for Deliverance, when they know well enough what muſt be done for that end, if you could be content to let them take that way which the Goſpel directs them to uſe.

Surely you do not make *doing* and *undoing*, reſolving well, and backſliding preſently after, part of your Method of Converſion! And when you deſcribe that Method, I ſuppoſe you pretend not to ſhew how often a man may fall after Repentance, and riſe again; but rather, what that man, who is at preſent under the Power and Guilt of ſin, muſt do, that he may be converted and forgiven. But the Method you have here laid down, is good for nothing, but either to amaze him, and make him wonder what you ſhould mean; or to make an Experiment what tame things the Underſtandings of *ſome men* are, how eaſie it is to play with their Ignorance, to make them ſlaves to a Faction, to work them into what paſſions you pleaſe, and to keep them under *amazements*, doubts, and enquiries, as long as you pleaſe, till you think fit to put an end to them your ſelf, by ſuch Arts and Devices as you have ready for that purpoſe.

Pray, Doctor, look over your *Scheme* again, and ſee whether it becomes a *grave* Divine to make this kind of ſport with the Souls of men: Upon ſecond thoughts, you may be convinced that you have

have preſumed, too much in all conſcience, upon the ſimplicity of your people; to lead them ſuch an *Antick* Dance, as you have done, while you were treating of ſo ſerious a matter, as the Method of Converſion from ſin to God.

You ſay, *The fixing of a ſenſe of ſin upon the Minde*, cauſeth *trouble and ſorrow, and the checking of Corruption by Conviction*; and this produceth *great endeavours of Reformation.* If the *Work* goes on further, what then? This, forſooth, will cauſe *great and ſtrange Conflicts between Corruption and Conviction*; and theſe Conflicts again will produce *ſome Endeavours*; and theſe Endeavours will produce great *Conflicts*, as before; and then comes in *the ſecret inſinuation of a principle of Life*: But beſides all this, a *deep ſenſe of the Souls Danger befals it*; and this ingenerates *ſorrow and ſhame, and fear of eternal wrath, and perplexing unſatisfactory Enquiries after ways of Deliverance.*

Now might you not have made theſe things to beget one another to the end of your Book, by the ſame Authority that you have made them do it ſo often? As for Example: You might here begin at the ſinners *perplexing Enquiries* (which you do very well to call *unſatisfactory*) and ſuppoſe him enlightened with the knowledge of their ſeveral *Reſolutions.* Now *Illumination*, you know, goes *before Conviction*; wherefore 'tis but making him to go under the Work of *Conviction* again till he comes to *enquire* again, and ſo your Method ſhall ſerve him as long as he lives, if you pleaſe. But you will ſay, that upon theſe Enquiries, you bring him to Chriſt for Deliverance; and

and that muſt needs *ſatisfie* and ſettle him. Perhaps it will, if you pleaſe, but not elſe; for he had as much reaſon to be ſettled and reſolved about the way of Deliverance, before you brought him to *Chriſt* this time, as he has now: Onely you had new tricks to ſhew him, for reaſons beſt known to your ſelf, and therefore you unſettled him when he was very well reſolved; and ſo you may do at any time, by the ſame reaſon, when you ſee it convenient for your purpoſe. For the ſinner, you know, was enlightened by the knowledge of the Goſpel ſome time ſince, and conſequently knew that there was no Salvation but by *Chriſt*: But if for all that you put him upon New Enquiries after the way of Salvation, and tell him, in anſwer to thoſe Enquiries, what he knew before, (though perhaps in other Phraſes) *viz.* that he muſt have Deliverance by *Chriſt*; I do not ſee but after all this you may ſend him upon the ſame Errand again, and that as often as you like it.

I do not think that you are able to give a good account even of that part of your Method, where you ſuppoſe the ſinner to be racked with ſo many Fears, Sorrows, and Conflicts, between Corruption and Conviction; the laſt of which you know comes to paſs by reaſon of his Endeavours after Reformation. Do not miſtake me, for I contend that Reformation is to be endeavoured with the greateſt zeal; and I grant, that Fear and Sorrow, and conflicting with our Luſts, or ſtriving againſt our evil Inclinations, are neceſſary in order to Reformation. But this I ſay, It ſeems to be Tyranny in men of your Principles, to require theſe *Conflicts and Vexations*, when you

you have to do with the Souls of men. Do but conſider your own Inſtructions to the ſinner, after you have created him ſo much trouble about Reformation: For you bid him beware of hoping to eſcape by *Amendment of life*, which you oppoſe to *coming to Chriſt*; and this he may do with all his ſins about him, nay 'tis his duty not to think himſelf too great a ſinner to *come to Chriſt*. Now had this advice been given in time, the poor ſinner might have been eaſed of all his Conflicts, without any loſs or danger to himſelf; and all the Terrours that befel him while he was endeavouring after Amendment, might have been ſpared. For when all is done, *coming to Chriſt* is the onely way to eſcape, and a man may come to *Chriſt* without that *legal Righteouſneſs* of Amendment of life. Nay, as we ſhall ſee afterward, you make this kinde of Righteouſneſs, *viz.* *Amendment*, a neceſſary effect of *coming* to *Chriſt* and *receiving* him. So that if Chriſt will take care to make the ſinner thus righteous, after he is *come* to him; and if his own care to be ſo ſignifies nothing to his coming to *Chriſt*, it might in all reaſon have been very well ſpared, together with all the Terrour and Amazement that went along with it. For if you ſay that the ſinner, by the inefficacy of his own endeavours, is to learn his need of *Chriſt*, and that by *coming to Chriſt* and *believing* in him, you mean employing the *Grace* he hath promiſed, and truſting that his ſincere endeavour being thereby *aſſiſted*, will ſucceed; then you did not *enlighten* your ſinner as you ought and might have done; and you were very cruel in concealing that ſo neceſſary Aſſiſtance from him, which if he had known, and betaken himſelf to, his endeavours would have ſucceeded

more

more proſperouſly, ſpeedily, and comfortably. But if you mean believing *Chriſts* promiſes of Pardon or Juſtification; neither ought *they* to have been concealed from the ſinner, becauſe they would have added great *encouragement* to his Endeavours after Reformation, and moreover convinced him of the *Neceſſity* thereof, had you repreſented them truly, with the *Conditions* on which they are ſuſpended. If you had gone thus to work, then the more you had convinced him of his ſins, and imprinted in his minde a deep ſenſe of the foul nature, and dangerous conſequences of them; *then*, I ſay, he would have ſeen the greater *Need* of *Chriſt*, he would more earneſtly have implored his *Grace* to *purifie* him, and the *Mercy* of God through his *Merits* to *pardon* him. But this is none of *your* Method.

Thus have I ſhewn what an *Amazing Labyrinth* this man has made of the Method of Converſion, or the *Works Preparatory* to Regeneration, to amuſe and perplex thoſe Souls withal that do not light upon an honeſter Guide. And upon the whole matter, I cannot but ſay, It is a ſad thing, that a Divine, and one that has had ſome Reputation for his Abilities, and is now of a conſiderable age, ſhould trifle at this rate with the Souls of men, and the moſt weighty matters of the Goſpel; eſpecially ſince we ſee that even amongſt Chriſtians there may be found men of Underſtandings ſo lamentably weak, as to make up a Congregation for him to practiſe ſuch Methods as this upon.

But I am apt to think the reſt of his Brethren that lead the Separation, will give him little thanks

thanks for publiſhing, ſo unadviſedly, the *choiceſt* Myſteries of the *Faction*.

SECT. II.

2. His *Scheme* of the *Preparatory Works*, *tends to the corrupting of mens Judgments about the State of Regeneration it ſelf*. For his way excludes *Reformation* and *Amendment* out of the notion of *Regeneration*. For he makes Reformation to be a Preparatory Work, and the Preparatory Works to be of another kinde of things than Regeneration it ſelf; and then I think it follows, that P. 192. Reformation and Regeneration are of two kinds of things; juſt as the *dryneſs of wood* is another ſort of thing than *firing or continual fire*. 'Tis indeed ſomething ſtrange that he ſhould make this difference between them, if it be conſidered that in this very Chapter he acknowledges, that Change of Affections, and Reformation of life, which are preparatory to Regeneration, to be *in* P. 198. *their own nature good and holy*. For one would be inclined to think, that according to the Doctor's Principles, Regeneration is of another kinde than that Change which is in its *own nature good and holy*; and by conſequence, that as the Unregenerate man may not be ſo bad, as the Doctor elſewhere ſuppoſes it neceſſary for him to be, ſo the Regenerate man, namely he whom *God goes out of his way, as it were*, to bring home to himſelf, may be a worſe man than the Unregenerate. Had the Doctor ſaid that there are divers Degrees of this good and holy Change, and that the difference of Degrees altered the kinde; that is, that the State of Regeneration con-

conſiſts in an *Univerſal* Reformation; this charge had been prevented. But he has not onely *ſaid no ſuch* thing, but he has plainly enough *affirmed* the contrary.

Witneſs what he ſaith in another place, *viz.* That *the natural minds firſt choice, is a life of ſin and pleaſure; but if by Afflictions or Convictions it be in Part, or WHOLLY forced to forſake and give up this life* (of ſin and pleaſure) *it will chuſe, magnifie, and extol a moral life, in, by, and under the Law*, i, e. a life of Vertue and Mortification, (which he is wont to diſgrace under the terms of a legal and moral life) *though at the laſt it will ſtand it in no more ſtead than the life of ſin and pleaſure.* This now is plain dealing; for here the Doctor does not mince the matter, as he endeavours to do in his talk about that *Reformation* which he makes preparatory to Regeneration, where he vainly ſuppoſes it neceſſarily liable to thoſe defects, which I have ſhewn they are not: But he tells us honeſtly, that though a man forego the life of ſin and pleaſure *wholly*, and chuſe the contrary, it will ſtand him in no ſtead at laſt, if he be yet a *natural*, i. e. an Unregenerate man.

Now if this be true, then *Holineſs* is ſo far from being *that* wherein the State of Regeneration in great part *conſiſts*, that it is not ſo much as a *certain Signe* thereof; which theſe men are ſometimes willing to grant it to be. Though they have not much *extol'd and magnified Morality*, yet they have been content it ſhould hold this place under *Regeneration*, viz. to give notice where it is. Now although it were not believed that

they

they are of the ſame Family, yet ſome good might be done upon men, ſo long as they are perſwaded that *they* always live in one place together: And we ſhould be well enough content to let them *truſt* to Regeneration onely, as *ſaving*, if they would *wholly forſake the life of Sin*, and be diligent in the practice of *Vertue*, becauſe being eaſily known, it could better diſcharge the office of a *Comforter*. But if the Doctor can part this good Company, I would fain know what comfort any man can take from a good Conſcience. For the beſt report that a mans Conſcience can make to him of himſelf, is, that he has *wholly forſaken the life of Sin*, and *choſen* the contrary. But if this may ſtand him in *no more ſtead* at laſt, than if he had been as lewd and wicked as ever he was, or any man can be; then, for all this, he may be a *Natural* and Unregenerate man ſtill: For I know the Doctor will not ſay that the Regenerate may periſh *at laſt* too. And is not Repentance and Obedience then a ſubſtantial mark of Regeneration? Or rather, is it not plain, that this man has quite corrupted the true notion of Regeneration, and turn'd it into a Fancy?

I ſhall now adde the concluſion of the Doctor's Method of Converſion; which we left, where he promiſes to conſider the *laſt thing whereby* Converſion, or the *Ingenerating* and *Acting of Faith*, *is compleated*.

He ſays, 1. *This is the peculiar Work of the Goſpel.* 2. *To this purpoſe it is neceſſary that the Goſpel be declared, and made known to convinced Sinners* (as if they had all this while been ignorant of it: Were they not well enlightened the mean while?) P. 308.

while ?) 3. *The Declaration of the Goſpel is accompanied with a Revelation of the Will of God,* which muſt needs be true, becauſe the Goſpel is *that* Revelation; and then he ſhews that we are bound to *believe* this Revelation. 4. *In the Declaration of the Goſpel, the Lord Chriſt is in as eſpecial manner propoſed as crucified and lift up for the eſpecial Object of our Faith,* which *includes in it an Invitation to come unto him for Life and Salvation.* 5. It is *declared withal for what end Chriſt is ſo propoſed* unto ſinners, *and this is in general, to ſave them from their Sins.* At this rate we ſhall never have done; for ſinners were ſaid to be Invited *to come unto him for Salvation,* juſt before. *6. It is propoſed and promiſed, that through and upon their believing, that is, on Chriſt, as propoſed in the Goſpel for the onely way of Salvation, convinced Sinners ſhall be pardoned, juſtified, and acquitted before God, diſcharged of the Law againſt them, through the Imputation unto them of what the Lord Chriſt hath done for them, and ſuffered in their ſtead:* That is to ſay, All that a convinced Sinner hath to do in order to his Pardon and Juſtification, is to believe that the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt is imputed to him, and, as you will yet more fully ſee by what follows, the way to have this Righteouſneſs imputed, is to believe it. For, 7. *To win over the Souls conſent to receive Chriſt, on the terms wherein he is propoſed:* Pray let us hear them; *That is, to believe in him, and truſt unto him, to what he is, hath done and ſuffered, and continueth to do for pardon of Sin, Life, and Salvation, the Goſpel is filled with Arguments, Invitations, Encouragements, Exhortations, Promiſes, all of them deſigned to declare the Love,* &c. *of God herein.* If all that is incumbent on the convinced Sinner, be to truſt to the Imputation

tation of Chriſts Righteouſneſs, then one would think indeed, that the Motives of the Goſpel are deſigned to win us over to a conſent to receive *Chriſt* in this faſhion. *In the due management and improvement of theſe parts* [Motives] *of the Goſpel, conſiſts the principal wiſdom and skill of the Miniſters of the New Teſtament:* That is, in *managing* all the *Exhortations* and *Promiſes* of the Goſpel in ſuch a manner, that though it is never ſo plain that the *Goſpel is filled with* them on purpoſe to move us to *Obedience* (which you do not vouchſafe to ſpeak one word of, or any thing like it) yet you ſhall make the people fancy that they are intended to win over their conſent to believe that he has done that for them. So that I perceive, the *principal skill and wiſdom of the Miniſters of the New Teſtament, lies* in perverting the Bible to *Antinomianiſm.* 8. *God frequently cauſeth ſome eſpecial Word, Promiſe, or Paſſage to fix it ſelf on the Minde of a Sinner. Hereby the Soul is firſt excited to exert and act the Faith wherewith it is endued, by the effectual working of the Spirit of God before deſcribed*; i. e. by an irreſiſtible Work. So that by this time the Work of Regeneration is done, *i. e.* of having Faith in the perſonal Righteouſneſs of Chriſt ingenerated in the Minde by an effectual Work of the Spirit; for to be Regenerate, according to *this man*, in *this place*, is to be ſtrongly perſwaded that Chriſt hath been righteous in our ſtead; and this, I confeſs, is of *another kinde* than to be righteous ones ſelf. But now whether this Faith was *ingenerated* upon the Souls *rejecting of Relief by Amendment* of life, or its *giving over to ſorrow*, or at ſome other time, the Doctor hath not told us; but 'tis ſlipt in cunningly at laſt, where we hear of the Souls

exerting the Faith it is endued withal. But sure 'tis a false step in the Method of Conversion, not to *endue* the Soul with Faith, before you bring it to *exert* and *act* the Faith wherewith it is endued. *9. The acting of Faith on Christ through the promise of the Gospel, for Pardon, Righteousness, and Salvation, is inseparably accompanied with, and that Faith is the Root and infallible Cause of an Universal Engagement of Heart unto all holy Obedience to God in Christ.* And therefore there was the less need of troubling a mans self about *Amendment* of life before his Regeneration, because it would infallibly proceed from it afterwards, *viz.* from acting of *Faith* on Christ, *i. e. believing* that *Christ* was righteous in his stead. And then the Doctor falls into a hot fit against his Adversaries, *who*, as he saith, *in a high course of a worldly life and profane, do charge others with preaching a Justification by Faith alone in Christ Jesus, unto a Neglect of Holiness, Righteousness, and Obedience to God, which such Scoffers and fierce Despisers of all that are good, do so earnestly plead for.* Not altogether so *fierce* as your self; witness this very malepart Saying of yours, in which you openly reflect upon many worthy Persons, with so much *indiscretion* and *unmannerliness*, that I am apt to think there are divers of your own Party, sober enough to condemn you for it, and to wish you had been wiser. But setting your ill words aside, I grant, you make it impossible for the Regenerate to *neglect* Holiness and Righteousness, but you should not presently defie us, because you do so; that is, because you suppose Holiness as necessary to them as *irresistible Power* can make it: For, by your leave, you do not suppose it necessary in order to Regeneration; for 'tis clear, accor-

according to you, that a man *may be* regenerated, (*i. e.* have that Faith you wot of *ingenerated* in his minde) nay, in this *Scheme*, that he *is* regenerated before you ſuppoſe him to be Righteous; ſince you firſt make that *Faith* in which Regeneration conſiſts to be *ingenerated*, and then the *acting* of that Faith to be the cauſe of Obedience. But now, after his Regeneration, you make it *ſo neceſſary* that he ſhould be Holy, that there is *no neceſſity* of putting himſelf to any trouble, or taking any care, to be ſo.

And ſo much for *your* Preparatory Works.

CHAP. II.

Of the Qualifications preparatory to Regeneration, according to the Holy Scriptures.

SECT. I.

THat Regeneration requires ſome *Preparedneſs* in the *Subject*, is evident from the Parable of the *Seed* that fell upon *different* ſorts of *ground*, *Mat.* 13. by which is meant the Goſpel preached to men of ſeveral Diſpoſitions: For the reaſon why the Seed was fruitful in one place and not in another, is there clearly ſuppoſed to be the *difference* of the places upon which it fell; the good Ground being that *onely* which yielded increaſe. It is farther implied, that the reaſon why the fruitful Ground brought forth a *more* plentiful increaſe in ſome places than in others, in *ſome an hundred fold*, in *ſome ſixty fold*, in *ſome thirty fold*, was becauſe the good Ground was in thoſe places *better* than in theſe. For the *Seed* was the ſame; and if the onely reaſon given why any Ground was fruitful, be the *goodneſs* of it, it follows, that the reaſon of greater fruitfulneſs in ſome places, is becauſe there the Ground is *better*.

Now, as *onely* the prepared Ground yielded Fruit, and as the preparedneſs of the Ground conſiſted in *its own* Goodneſs; ſo alſo there is ſome

ſome preparedneſs of the *Minde it ſelf*, neceſſary to *underſtand the Word, to keep it, and to bring forth fruit with patience*, i. e. neceſſary to *Regeneration*; and according to ſuch preparation, men will more or leſs improve under the Miniſtration of the Goſpel.

Seeing therefore that not onely our Chriſtianity, but the degrees thereof, depend hereupon; ſeeing a *total unpreparedneſs* is the cauſe why ſome remain as unfruitful as ever they were; and the *imperfection* of a prepared ſtate is likewiſe the reaſon why others bring forth leſs fruit than they ought; it cannot be denied to be a *profitable* enquiry, *wherein this Preparation conſiſts*. And this I ſhall endeavour to ſhew in the firſt place; in order whereunto, it is farther obſervable, that,

SECT. 2.

That Preparedneſs of *Minde* which our Lord means, conſiſteth of ſome *Moral Qualification* thereof; as is plain from *Luke* 8. where that which anſwers to the good Ground in the Parable (he himſelf being his own Interpreter) is *an honeſt and good Heart*. Again, this Honeſty and Goodneſs of Heart being all the Preparedneſs which is needful, it is reaſonable to ſuppoſe that under *it* are comprehended whatſoever moral Endowments are either elſewhere particularly noted by our Saviour, or may by conſequence from other paſſages in his Sermon be concluded to be needful for this end. And,

1. It is obſervable that there is no good diſ-

poſition which our Lord takes more notice of in his Sermons, and honours with more teſtimonies of his approbation, than that of a *meek* and humble Spirit; and that not onely as an excellent quality in it ſelf, but as leading to all other goodneſs. Thus when he invites the guilty to *come* to him, *Mat.* 11. *Learn of me*, ſaith he, *for I am meek and lowly, and you ſhall finde reſt to your ſouls*; intimating, that the firſt Vertue wherein they were to imitate him, if they would become his Diſciples, and gain peace thereby, was that of *Humility*. Again, *John* 10. where he calls his Diſciples his *Sheep*, ſignifying thereby that they were of a meek and ductile temper; he tells the reſt, *v.* 25. *Ye believe not, becauſe ye are not of my ſheep*, i. e. becauſe of your haughty and untractable Spirits. So, *Mark* 10. 14. where we finde our Saviour taking *the little children* to him; the reaſon he gives for ſo doing, is very remarkable: *For*, ſaith he, *of ſuch is the kingdom of heaven*, of ſuch who are like thoſe, *gentle, pliable*, and *eaſie to learn. Verily I ſay unto you, Whoſoever ſhall not receive the kingdom of God as a little childe, he ſhall not enter therein*; i. e. whoever is not prepared by a *meek* and *flexible* diſpoſition, will never receive the Goſpel. Laſtly, all this being conſidered, it may be no unreaſonable conjecture, that our Saviour therefore began his divine Sermon, upon the Mount, with bleſſing the *poor in ſpirit*, thoſe that have an humble opinion of themſelves, becauſe they were prepared to embrace all his following inſtructions: And if it may be obſervable, that he pronounced the very ſame Bleſſing to them, which in the concluſion of his Bleſſings, he promiſed to thoſe that arrive to the *ſuffering of perſecution for righteouſneſs*

See 1 part, 4 chap.

ouſneſs ſake; for *theirs is the kingdom of heaven*: this ſeeming to imply, that an humble tractable minde, is a beginning which ſurely promiſes, and leads to the greateſt perfection.

More particularly, this good temper conſiſts of the *Teachableneſs* of the *Underſtanding*, and the *Tractableneſs* of the *Will*; by the former of which a man is prepared to yield to the *Truth*, though it prove contrary to his preſent opinions; and by the latter, to ſubmit to any Divine *Law*, though it makes ſomething to be his duty that is contrary to his former practices. Now whoever is thus diſpoſed, is eaſily convinced of the Truth, and brought to Reformation, under due means of inſtruction. Wherefore ſince the *Honeſt and Good Heart* comprehends all moral Endowments preparatory to *Faith* and *Obedience*, it muſt needs in part conſiſt of this. Beſides, it is plain, that our Saviour in *Luke* 8. ſpeaks of ſuch *honeſty* and *goodneſs* of heart, as may conſiſt with an unregenerate ſtate. Therefore the Meekneſs of receiving inſtruction is contained under it: For he that does not actually *believe*, may be *Teachable*; and he that does not yet underſtand his duty, may have a tractable Will, and be ready to obey Inſtruction.

2. If we obſerve that the promiſe of *everlaſting Life*, was that *motive* which our Saviour ever uſed to commend his Doctrine withal, to the conſideration of his hearers; and that he always went about to win their attention by awakening them to the thoughts of their everlaſting ſtate; we may then farther diſcern what kinde of Hearers he deſired, and thereby what makes that

Good and Honeſt Heart, which prepares a man to be a Chriſtian. For the promiſe of eternal Happineſs being the great and leading Motive of the Goſpel, according as men are affected with that Promiſe, ſo they will be profitable or unprofitable hearers of God's Word. To the former, all the *Evangeliſts* give witneſs, as you cannot but have obſerved, if you have read them with ordinary care. However, I ſhall briefly give you ſome inſtances hereof, as they lie together in St. *John*; beginning with our Saviour's diſcourſe to *Nicodemus*. The firſt thing he ſaid to him was, *Except a man be born again, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God*, John 3. 3. which makes it probable that *Nicodemus* his firſt queſtion was concerning the common Argument of our Lords Sermons, *viz.* what muſt be done to enter into eternal Life. In ſhort, the ſum of our Saviours diſcourſe to him, and that which all the reſt tended to, you have, *v.* 16. *For God ſo loved the world, that he gave his onely begotten Son, that whoſoever believeth in him, ſhould not periſh, but have* EVERLASTING LIFE. Go but a little farther, and you finde him diſcourſing with a woman of *Samaria*, and taking an occaſion from an ordinary requeſt, to tell her, that *if ſhe had known the gift of God, ſhe would have asked of him, and he would have given her living water, a well of water ſpringing up into* EVERLASTING LIFE, John 4. 10. 14. In the *next Chapter* we finde that he had occaſion given him to aſſert his own Authority againſt the *Jews*; where, to put them upon conſideration, he vehemently tells them, *Verily, verily*, I ſay unto you, He that heareth my Word, and believeth on him that ſent me, hath *everlaſting life*, and ſhall not come into

into *condemnation. Verily, verily*, I ſay unto you, The hour is coming, and now is, when the dead ſhall hear the voice of the Son of God, *&c.* v. 24, 25. All that are in the graves ſhall hear his voice, and ſhall come forth; they that have done good, unto the *Reſurrection of Life*; and they that have done evil, unto the *Reſurrection of Damnation*, v. 28, 29. Not long after, he was followed for the Miracle of the Loaves; which opportunity he made uſe of to ſay to them that did ſo, Labour not for the Meat which periſheth, but for that Meat which endureth to *Everlaſting Life*, which the Son of Man ſhall give unto you, *John* 6. 27. Finally, in *this Chapter* you finde him diſcourſing with the *Jews* again, who believed not, where he ſtill urgeth the ſame conſideration, *v.* 35. 40, &c. But towards the concluſion of *that Chapter*, the not valuing of immortal happineſs above the enjoyments of this preſent life, ſeems plainly to be given as the reaſon why ſome believed not. For, *v.* 65. our Saviour tells the Jews, *No man can come unto me, except it were given him of my Father:* And from that time many of his Diſciples went back, and walked no more with him. Then ſaid *Jeſus* unto the Twelve, Will ye alſo go away? Then *Peter* anſwered him, *Lord, to whom ſhall we go? thou haſt the words of* ETERNAL LIFE. Which anſwer intimates why thoſe other Diſciples went back, *viz.* becauſe their affections were ſo glued to this preſent world, that they little cared for a *Future*, though *eternal* happineſs: And it is probable that theſe were the men whom our Saviour taxed for not having cordially embraced his Doctrine, *v.* 64. *But there are ſome of you that believe not.*

To

To this purpoſe you may obſerve in reading the Acts of the holy Apoſtles, that the generality of the firſt Converts amongſt the Gentiles, were of the *Gentile worſhippers*, or the *ſtrangers Proſelytes*, who together with the *Jews*, worſhipped one God, and profeſſed the hope of a *Life to come* (ſuch as *Cornelius* and his friends.) Whenever the Apoſtles had to do with theſe men, they found them very tractable, and forward to believe. And it is this obſervation I conceive that gives the cleareſt light to the meaning of that miſunderſtood Text in *Acts* 13. 48. *And as many as were ordained to eternal life believed.* So we tranſlate; but ὅσοι τεταγμένοι ἦσαν, might as well have been rendred, *As many as were ſet in order*, or *made ready*; and then the Context had plainly illuſtrated the Text: For in the ſame *verſe* we finde that this was ſpoken of the *Gentiles*, who were *glad*, and *glorified God*, that the Word of *Salvation* and *Everlaſting Life*, v. 46, 47. belonged to them alſo. But who *theſe Gentiles* were, we learn more particularly from *v.* 43. *viz.* that they were ſome σεβομένων προσηλύτων, of the *worſhipping Proſelytes*; who believed a life to come, and ſought for the happineſs thereof, who therefore were in a *fit poſture* to lay hold on *that* great promiſe of the Goſpel, and well *prepared* to hear what the Apoſtles had to ſay concerning the onely way and means of attaining it.

See Mr. Mede's *Diſc.*

Wherefore ſeeing the promiſe of *Eternal Life* was generally uſed by our Saviour, to gain attention to the reſt of his Doctrine; ſeeing alſo men were induced to embrace Chriſtianity, according as they *valued* that promiſe, and were *affected* with

with it; it follows, that, according to our Saviours Judgment, and the Teſtimony of Scripture, a mans preparedneſs to become a true Chriſtian, conſiſts in great part of a juſt eſteem and concern for the *end* of Chriſtianity, *viz. Life Everlaſting.*

Finally, this Diſpoſition or Affection is ſome part of that *Honeſt and Good Heart*, mentioned in St. *Luke*; for it may be in one, who yet is not a Diſciple. A man *may* be ſeriouſly affected with the promiſe of *Eternal Life*, and propound *Salvation* to himſelf as his *End*, or rather, he muſt do ſo before he ſubmits heartily to every condition neceſſary to obtain it: For, *the kingdom of heaven is like to a Merchant-man ſeeking goodly Pearls, who when he had found one Pearl of great price, he went and ſold all that he had and bought it*, Mat. 13. 45, 46. Thus doth our Saviour expreſs that *ſelf-denial* which he required of all his Diſciples, aſſuring them thereupon that they ſhould finde *Treaſure* in Heaven. Now as the *preciouſneſs* of the *Pearl* was ſuppoſed to recompence abundantly the ſeeming dearneſs of the purchaſe; ſo the reaſon why the Merchant was content, or rather (as the foregoing Parable, *verſe* 44. intimates) extremely glad to *ſell all* that he might be enabled to make the purchaſe, was becauſe he *firſt* valued the Pearl according to its worth.

SECT. 3.

Which of theſe two Diſpoſitions, *viz. Meekneſs* and *Concern for the End*, is either *firſt*, or has the *greateſt force* and efficacy in leading to Regeneration,

tion, is not needful to ſay. It may be obſerved, that ſuch commendations are given of each in the Scripture, as if *either* of them were *ſufficient* to prepare, and yet *both* are *neceſſary*; which implies, that they who heard the Goſpel with *either* of theſe preparations, did not want the other. And it ſeems plain that either of them makes way for the other to follow.

A deep *ſenſe* and ſtrong *deſire* of *Eternal Happineſs*, will cauſe the *meekneſs* of ſubmitting to Inſtruction about the means of obtaining it, rendring the Underſtanding teachable in the Truth of Chriſtianity, and the Will tractable to the Obedience thereof. Again, *Meekneſs* diſpoſes to attention in comparing a Future Eternal Happineſs with all preſent Intereſts, and by conſequence to the making of an impartial Judgement between them, in preferring the former unſpeakably before the latter. Therefore, where *both* theſe Diſpoſitions are, the preſence of the one ſtrengthens the other; from which it receives again as much aſſiſtance as it yields. He that is awakened into a *ſenſe* of his Eternal State, will *increaſe* in Meekneſs; the more he is concerned for his own Salvation, the leſs will he be aſhamed to own either his ignorance or miſtakes, and the farther off from thinking much to ſubmit to that inſtruction and reformation which is needful to ſecure ſo great an Intereſt. Again, the *meek* man, who is ready to embrace Truth, and diſpoſed to obey, is in the way of gaining more diſtinct and lively apprehenſions of his *Eternal State*, his Judgment not being overborn with prejudice and paſſion.

Finally,

Finally, ſince they have an equal influence upon each other, they ſeem to contribute equally towards Regeneration. But inſtead of comparing them with one another, it will be more profitable to ſhew what need there is of *both*, as well in order to Chriſtian *Belief*, as *Practice*.

As to the former, it is conſiderable, that onely the *meek* Teachable Spirit is ſuted to that way of conviction in which the Goſpel is propounded to men. Had the Doctrine of *Chriſt* been demonſtrated to us with ſuch evidence as muſt have *forced* the aſſent of every man, *Faith* had not been *rewardable*; as on the other hand, if the proof thereof had not been certain, and *ſufficient* to determine a wiſe man, *Infidelity* had not been *puniſhable*. Now God in his *wiſdom* hath given us the latter evidence, but not the former. Therefore although Chriſtianity needs not that men ſhould be fooliſhly credulous, ſince the evidence thereof will bear a fair trial, and is ſufficient to remove all ground of reaſonable doubting; yet we muſt deſire them to conſider it without *prejudice and paſſion*, ſince it is not of that nature, as to force any mans aſſent, who is not willing to learn.

When the truth of our Saviours Doctrine ſhin'd in the Miracles which he wrought before the faces of his enemies, even then it could not enlighten thoſe that had no minde to ſee. And therefore our Saviour did not always apply himſelf to the Phariſees in a way of Inſtruction, but rather choſe to ſilence their arrogance; he anſwered their cavilling Queſtions, with Queſtions, not ſo much to lead them into the Truth, againſt which

which they were obſtinately bent, as to check their inſolence, and to leave them ſpeechleſs, *Mat.* 21. 23, &c. *Mat.* 22. 41, &c. But to the humble and meek, he always applied himſelf, by taking all fit occaſions, and uſing all proper ways to inſtruct them.

This is one inſtance of Gods *reſiſting the proud, and giving Grace to the humble*, that the *knowledge* of Salvation it ſelf is communicated in ſuch a way as the *meek* man will eaſily profit by, whilſt the *proud* is ready to ſtumble at it.

Farther, a *Concern for the End* is needful to cauſe *diligence* and *ſincerity* in endeavouring to *know* all Neceſſary Truth: For according as the *End* is eſteemed, ſo we ſhall be more or leſs ſollicitous to underſtand the right Means. Aſſuredly, the worldly-minded man, who little values the promiſe of Eternal Life, is either little concern'd whether the Doctrine of Chriſtianity be *true* or *falſe*, or at leaſt he had rather not finde it to be true; which is always a great impediment to *believing*: He wants that Motive to inform himſelf of the *Truth*, and to learn his *whole* Duty, which of all others is the moſt likely to prevail. I do not ſay that a *ſerious* regard to our *Future* State, is *abſolutely* neceſſary to a *Right* Faith, in oppoſition either to *mere Ignorance*, or *erroneous Opinion*; for I doubt Experience does ſometimes ſhew the contrary: But I ſay, that that *worldly* Spirit which is implied in the want *thereof*, tends to make men careleſs of Inſtruction in Divine things, and to alienate their mindes from the love of Gods Word; and as to thoſe, whom it does not take off from all ſtudy of Religion, it does at leaſt

leaſt infect their mindes with a ſecret diſloyalty to the Truth, and ſometimes actually perverts their Judgment, by directing their Labours to a wrong End.

But although this *Preparation* of Meekneſs, and a juſt eſteem of the Reward to come, may not be ſo *abſolutely* neceſſary to qualifie a man for ſome good degree of Faith and Chriſtian knowledge; yet without it we are not at all *fit* for the *practice* of Chriſtianity, that practice thereof, I mean, which the State of *Regeneration* implies. For ſuch practice requires, *firſt*, an humble *ſubmiſſion* of minde to all the Laws of our Saviour *Chriſt*; and, *ſecondly*, an honeſt *Application* of thoſe Laws to our particular Actions; to both which, eſpecially to the latter, this *Preparation* is neceſſary.

1. To a quiet and humble ſubmiſſion to *all* the Laws of our Saviour: For there are ſome of theſe which the proud and worldly man, while he ſo continues, can never approve of, namely, ſuch as thoſe which concern *forgiving of Injuries*, *loving of Enemies*, *enduring Affronts patiently*, and *ſuffering Perſecution contentedly*. From the nature of theſe Rules themſelves, it is plain, that men muſt lay aſide their *Self-will*, and take the *Authority* of God for a ſufficient Obligation, and the *Promiſes* of God for a ſufficient Encouragement to do what he commands; or elſe they will at firſt be ready to object againſt them, if not to caſt them behinde their backs. As to thoſe Rules of Chriſtianity in particular, which reſtrain from *Revenge*, how hard is it to perſwade ſome men that we are in good earneſt when we tell them, they cannot be ſaved upon other terms than

than of obeying *them?* For they pretend, that as the world goes, thoſe Rules are not reducible to practice, by a *wiſe* man; that there is no living amongſt men, if they muſt be content to be call'd *Cowards*, and tamely expoſe their honours, and perhaps their fortunes, by putting up an Affront without a Challenge. And thus are all the very beſt Rules of the Goſpel ſerved, which requiring the higheſt vertues, and conſequently moſt of all contradicting the inordinate paſſions, and ſometimes claſhing with the worldly intereſts of men, are therefore mutinied againſt, and many *inconveniences* are laid to their charge: That is, proud and fooliſh man talks as if he were wiſer than God, and knew better than *Infinite Wiſdom* what is fit to be made a Law to his Creatures. He that intends to be a Chriſtian indeed, muſt begin with this neceſſary principle of Humility and Meekneſs, that he is not to pretend difficulty and inconvenience againſt any of the Laws of God, as if they were eſtabliſht without due conſideration had to our condition in this world; he muſt lay it down to himſelf for an unalterable Rule, That *he needs not deſire any better reaſon to govern his Converſation by, than the Will and Word of God:* Without this Preparation, he will ſoon be *offended.* Farther, that one command of *taking up the Croſs*, even to *loſing* of the *life*, if need be, plainly ſhews that a man cannot be prepared for univerſal Obedience, without making the *Future* and *Everlaſting Reward* his *Aim* and *Hope.* There are many kinds of ſin ruinous to a mans good eſtate in this life, and ſeveral duties of Religion, ſome of which do evidently promote a worldly Happineſs, and others are at leaſt conſiſtent with it. And therefore the *Wiſdom* of this world may re-

reſtrain a man from much evil; it may lead him to ſome good actions, and not hinder him in others. But nothing leſs than the Hope of Heaven can carry him to *all* Chriſtian Obedience, even to *deny himſelf*, and *take up his Croſs*, and *follow Chriſt*, as he *muſt* do, that *will be* his *Diſciple*. Here, at leaſt, the *Wiſdome* of this World will betray him if he leans upon it, or rather if he be not ſupported by the hope of that reward in Heaven, which cannot be rival'd by Life itſelf. A man therefore cannot be prepared for an univerſal Submiſſion to the Will of God, without propounding to himſelf Everlaſting Life, as his end. He may *put his hand to the plough*, but he will *draw it back again*, becauſe he is *not fit for the Kingdom of Heaven*.

2. A meek and tractable ſpirit, with a ſincere aim at eternal Happineſs, is neceſſary in order to a *due application of the general Rules of the Goſpel to our particular actions*. In the doing of this, there is ſo much room for Deceit and Inſincerity to come in, that we had need be influenced by an ingenuous temper, and a ſingle eye at the reward of Heaven. The truth hereof will be beſt diſcern'd by ſome Inſtances. We are commanded to *diſtribute* and *give alms* of ſuch things as we have, and to do it *freely* and *liberally* according to our *Ability*: But now the eſtimation of our Ability, and the rating of our Alms in proportion to it, is in great meaſure left to our own *Prudence* and *Conſcience*; But where a *Party* is left to be a *Judge*, he had need be very *impartial*, to deal uprightly: And in this caſe, if a man be ſelfiſh and froward, he will deal penuriouſly; as if it were enough to give away

his *Braſs* Money, while he hoards up his *Silver* and *Gold*; for which he has this pretence, that the *proportion* of his Alms is not determin'd to his hand, and muſt be left to his own *Diſcretion*. Again, the Goſpel prohibits *Idleneſs*, *Drunkenneſs*, and *corrupt Communication* in general terms; but 'tis not ſaid particularly, how many hours in a day I am to ſpend in honeſt Labour and Induſtry, and in the exerciſe of Devotion; nor what quantity of Wine this and that perſon may lawfully drink; nor are thoſe limits exactly defined, where honeſt Mirth ends, and corrupt Communication begins. And from hence the *froward* man may take occaſion to tranſgreſs the bounds of his Duty, and plead for himſelf, that you cannot punctually deſcribe them out of the Bible.

Now, as on the one ſide many Precepts of Religion and Virtue which are given to all Mankinde, *are not capable* of being delivered otherwiſe than in General terms; becauſe of that infinite variety of circumſtances amongſt particular perſons, which ſo often alters the caſe, and requires a difference in applying the ſame Rule: So, on the other ſide, it is *not needful* that ſuch Rules of Vertue ſhould be deſcribed otherwiſe than they are, if men are *duely* prepared to uſe them, that is, by *a tractable ingenuous temper*, by *a ſerious concern for their future ſtate*, and a deſire to pleaſe God in all things; which are the great *Poſtulata* or Demands in the *Chriſtian Law*, and may reaſonably be required of all thoſe to whom it is delivered.

But till they are thus diſpoſed, the moſt *particular*

cular Rules, made ready for *immediate* uſe, will not ſerve to retain them within their Duty, much leſs ſuch general Rules, which (becauſe they are *but* general) may be more eaſily eluded; ſince the difficulty of *underſtanding* their Duty may be pretended againſt the latter, with much more colour than it can be pretended againſt the former: And *ſuch* difficulty there is indeed, which doth not (as they may pretend) ariſe from the *General Terms* of the Rule, but only from *themſelves*; and is no other way to be overcome, but by mending their own defects. For the proof whereof, I ſhall inſtance in a general Precept of Religion, very plain and intelligible *of it ſelf*, and *eaſie* to be applied to thoſe particular caſes which may come under it; which doth notwithſtanding require the *Preparedneſs* of an *honeſt and good heart*, to uſe it aright, and to apply it as it ought to be.

I mean that Rule of *Doing unto all men as we would they ſhould do to us*. Now this is a very plain Rule for our dealings with other men. For though a man may not know what is *Law* or *Cuſtome* in this and that caſe; yet every man knows how he would be dealt with himſelf. 'Tis a Rule alſo which no man can juſtly except againſt, becauſe it obliges all men to *equal* dealing with one another. It is plain likewiſe, that the applying of this Rule upon any particular occaſion, conſiſts, in ſuppoſing our ſelves to be in the *circumſtances* of thoſe men with whom we have any thing to do, and them to be in ours; and then in doing the very ſame things to them, which we conclude would be fair and reaſonable for us to expect from them. But now there is

nothing but an *honeſt* and *good* Heart can ſecure a man from the temptation of being partial to his own intereſt in determinng what is *fair* & *reaſonable*, when *another*, not himſelf, is to enjoy the preſent advantage of an equal determination. For if there be not that to ſway againſt *Selfiſhneſs*, this will carry it to the prejudice of his Neighbour. Hence it is, that in matters of Kindneſs we are apt to do *too little*, and yet we ſay we ſhould expect *no more*: In matters of civil reſpect we are ready to look for *more* than is due, and pretend that we ſhould give *as much*, if it were our own caſe. When occaſions of Forbearance and Forgiveneſs happen, we aggravate the provocation to the utmoſt, and perſwade ourſelves, that had we offended another ſo, it had been but reaſonable to expect the like bitterneſs. But now if I did not only *ſuppoſe* my ſelf in the circumſtances of another perſon, but *really were* ſo; I ſhould have thought much to have been ſo hardly forgiven, after the offence: If I had ſtood in need of my Neighbours Charity, and received no more than I give, it would have ſeemed *Illiberality*; And the ſame may be ſaid in all like caſes. It is hard for the ſelfiſh man to put himſelf right into the circumſtances of his Neighbour; and when he has done ſo, he is apt to be partial in weighing what is fit to be done afterward. Now if *Self-Love* is always ſo ready to turn the Scales which ſhould be equally poiſed one againſt the other, we had need be influenced by an ingenuous purpoſe of performing our Duty, and a ſtedfaſt aim at eternal Happineſs, that theſe diſpoſitions may weigh againſt Self-love, and keep the ballance *even*, when we are doing right between our Neighbour and our ſelves.

From

From theſe Inſtances it may be gathered, that *a meek Spirit*, with an *earneſt deſire of Salvation*, muſt be a Law to our minds, or we ſhall never be able to frame our particular actions, according to the General Rules of the Goſpel.

Indeed, a Spiritual Guide, a wiſe and godly Friend, and good Books, are very uſeful for this purpoſe; but then, they are not always at hand, nor can they reach to every particular occurrence of life, adminiſtring occaſion for doing well or ill; or if they did, the *proud* and *worldly* man is not diſpoſed to receive that direction from them, which the *humble* is always glad of, and thankfully embraceth. For *Meekneſs*, and *Concern for Heaven*, do not only make a man ſagacious and diſcerning in matters of *Sin* and *Duty*, but alſo willing to uſe all forreign helps of Inſtruction, and capable of receiving benefit by the uſe of them.

Seeing, therefore, theſe Diſpoſitions of minde are neceſſary to prepare us for *an univerſal approbation* of the Laws of *Chriſt*; ſeeing they are neceſſary to qualifie us for *the right application* of theſe Laws, to our particular actions; ſeeing alſo that the practice of Chriſtianity depends upon theſe two things; it follows, that we cannot be Chriſtians in *Practice*, till we are thus diſpoſed.

SECT. 4.

As theſe Works are *neceſſary* to prepare us to become true Chriſtians, ſo they are *ſufficient*:

And this, I think, may be gathered from the forementioned Parable of the *Seed*, by comparing the *prepared* and the *unprepared* Hearers together. The firſt ſort of the *unprepared*, are they which *hear the word and underſtand it not*, Matth. 13. 19. *i. e.* who want a meek and *teachable* Spirit, hearing indeed, but not bending their Mindes to conſider and learn; *Then cometh the wicked one, and catcheth away that which was ſown in their hearts, i. e.* eaſily defaceth thoſe *ſuperficial* Impreſſions which the Truth made upon their mindes, and prevaileth with them to think of it no more, *Leſt they ſhould believe and be ſaved*, *Luke* 8. 12. The ſecond ſort are thoſe, who having receivd the Word *with Joy*, are *offended* when *Tribulation* or *Perſecution ariſeth.* And the third, thoſe in whom the *Word is choaked with the care of this world and the deceitfulneſs of riches*, Matth. 13. 20, *&c.* Now the Unpreparedneſs of both theſe, ſeems plainly to conſiſt in this, that they did not rightly value eternal Life, nor ſtedfaſtly propound it to themſelves as their chief end: The *latter* ſtill preferring the *riches* and *pleaſures* of this world before it; the former not having deliberately reſolved to abide the *Tribulations* and *Adverſities* of this world, rather than forego it; for which reaſon they are ſaid, *Not to have root in themſelves, i. e.* to want that firmneſs of reſolution, which is neceſſary againſt a time of Suffering. Theſe are *all* the unprepared. Therefore they are *fully* prepared, who are meek and teachable, and undervalue the Life that *now is*, in compariſon of that which *is to come*; Theſe are they that will *underſtand the word and keep it, and bring forth fruit with patience.*

There

There are indeed *other* Preparations towards Converſion, more inſiſted upon by ſome Divines, than thoſe which I have been diſcourſing of; ſuch as the *Knowledge* of Truth; the *Fear of Hell*; *the Hope of Pardon*; *Good Purpoſes* and *Reſolutions*; *Prayer*; *Faſting*; *Watching*; and *prevailing againſt ſome Temptations*, which were wont heretofore to prevail themſelves. And I do not deny, but theſe are very Neceſſary Preparatives, in order to a thorough Reformation. But they ſeem to me, to be either implied in thoſe which I have already named, or to be naturally conſequent upon them.

The knowledge of ſome part of that Truth which has an Influence upon practice, is implied in *Concern* for the *End*, which moreover makes a man diligent to know all Neceſſary Truth; and together with *Meekneſs*, prepares the Minde for farther Inſtruction.

As for that *Fear* and *Hope* which are grounded upon the *Threatnings* and *Promiſes* of the Goſpel: He that rightly underſtands *theſe*, and is *concerned* for his *future ſtate* above all other Intereſts, cannot but be *afraid* of Hell, and finde much Joy and Comfort in the *Hope* of Gods Pardon, and Eternal Life.

As for *Sorrow* for ſin paſt, grounded upon ſome Motive of the Goſpel: no man is capable of it, till he *cares* for his *own Soul*; and then he can no more be without *Sorrow*, than without Fear. But *Meekneſs* and *Humility*, by opening the Minde to *all* holy reaſoning and Inſtruction,

bringeth it under the power of every conſideration ſuggeſted in the Goſpel, upon which that *Godly Sorrow* for ſin is founded, *which worketh Repentance.*

A *Reſolution* to forſake ſin, is conſequent upon the Fear of God's Threatnings, the Hope of his Promiſes, Sorrow for ſin paſt, and a meek, tractable, ſubmiſſive Spirit at preſent; for the bettering of which Reſolution, he that is concern'd for his Salvation above all things, will *particularly examine his former ways*, as he is able; which is a means of Regeneration contributing as greatly thereunto, as any of this ſort which can be named.

Prayer and Devotion, *Faſting* and Humiliation, *Watching* to avoid Temptations, and to eſcape under them, are the Souls actual *endeavour* againſt Sin, in purſuance of its own Reſolution, and proper expreſſions of *Humility*, and *Care for the Soul.* To which Helps we are to reckon *Meditation* upon Divine things, another certain Effect of *Religious Concern*, and a means whereby Truth is made more preſent to the minde, and more ready for uſe, upon all occaſions of withſtanding Temptation.

Finally, As ſure as *God giveth Grace to the Humble*, ſo ſhall every one who is diligent in the uſe of theſe Means and Helps, *ſoon* from thence reap *much* good fruit in the *Reformation* of his Heart and Life, and *Power* to reſiſt Temptation, and thereby encouragement to proceed, till all Sin be ſubdued, and every Saving Grace is wrought within him.

By

By all which it may be discerned, that *Meekneſs*, and *concern for the End*, are the *Leading* and *Principal* Preparatives to Regeneration; and theſe latter, *Secondary* and *Conſequent* upon, or implied in thoſe, as being either the natural expreſſions, or the proper effects of them.

Which may be the reaſon why the Scripture takes more notice of a *Meek* Spirit, and *Concern* for the Life to come, under the notion of Diſpoſitions and Preparations towards Converſion; than of the other, which were now produced. And though I have not conformed the Method of my Diſcourſe upon this Subject, to the example of Dr. *Owen* and the Writers of his way, (who ſeem to lay no great ſtreſs upon thoſe Preparations which I eſteem to be the principal, and who hardly ever mention that of a *meek*, and *tractable* Spirit) yet I hope it will not be the leſs, but more profitable, if I have only forſaken them ſo far as I have followed the Guidance of the Scripture.

The Concluſion of what hath been ſaid, ſhould be to exhort Men to the Study of Meekneſs and Humility, and to a ſerious regard of their Eternal ſtate; and, that the Exhortation may be the more effectual, to ſhew them how *this Spirit* may be obtained. To which end I ſhall offer what I have to ſay, after one Queſtion is ſatisfied, which if the Doctor and his Friends had not troubled, might very well have been omitted.

SECT.

SECT. 5.

The Queſtion is, How far the *Preparations* to Regeneration, differ from *Regeneration* it ſelf. And in the firſt place, I do not think the difference is ſo great, as the Doctor ſuppoſes it to be. What his opinion is about this matter, we have ſeen already. I ſhall now ſet down my own.

1. The *ſtate* of *Regeneration* doth in part conſiſt of thoſe Graces which are *Preparatory* thereunto. On the one hand, by Regeneration a man doth not loſe *Meekneſs* and *Humility*, and *Concern* for his Salvation: On the other hand, 'tis impoſſible he ſhould be Regenerate without being meek, and humble, and Heavenly-minded. In like manner, the *Fear* of God's Diſpleaſure, and *Hope* of his Mercy, and *Sorrow* for Sin, and good *Reſolution*, and devout *Prayer* and *Meditation*, are Chriſtian Graces and Duties; and, as ſuch, neceſſary to the ſtate of a *regenerate* man, to the end of his life: Therefore thoſe Effects of the Holy Spirit, by which he was prepared, do not differ in *kinde* from *all* thoſe which make him Regenerate: The reaſon is plain, becauſe *ſome* of them are the *ſame*.

Again, Faith is a Means of Holineſs of Life; Therefore *one part* of the ſtate of Regeneration is preparatory to *another*.

2. Since a Regenerate ſtate conſiſts of all ſaving Graces, and implies Obedience to every Commandment of our Lord Jeſus; He that is mere-

merely in a ſtate of Preparation, differs thus far from the Regenerate, that the former wanteth *ſome* Graces neceſſary to Salvation, the latter wanteth *none*; the *one* is in a good way of attaining *all*, the *other* is in actual poſſeſſion of them: there is at leaſt *ſome* worldly or carnal Luſt, which *the Prepared* is *ſtriving* againſt, but he hath not yet got the better of it; there is *none* which *the Regenerate* hath not ſubdued, *having crucified the Fleſh with the Affections and Luſts thereof.* Wherefore Regeneration differs from *mere* Preparedneſs, as the *whole* doth from a *part*; and the Prepared Minde becomes Regenerate, not by a *total* change of its preſent ſtate, but by an *addition* of ſomething which was wanting in it before.

3. Since Grace and Virtue encreaſe by exerciſe, and ſince the ſeveral virtues of a Chriſtian do mutually aſſiſt each other, thriving more when they are united, than when they are ſolitary; it may be ſaid farther, that thoſe good Qualifications which the Regenerate was endued with in his prepared State, are now improved to greater perfection. Meekneſs and Humility are more deeply rooted in his *temper*, and more conſpicuous in his *behaviour*; in his concern for Heaven he is more *Zealous*, as having had ſome experience of the Heavenly Life, and being more ſenſible of the vanity of Worldly things. In his Prayers he is more *devout* and *frequent*; in good Meditations more *attentive* and *permanent*; in Holy Reſolutions more *ſatisfied* and *inflexible*; and in his whole Converſation more *vigilant* and *circumſpect*. Indeed *Fear* and *Sorrow*, although they are neceſſary for a good beginning, and in ſome degree inſe-

inſeparable from the beſt ſtate of a good Chriſtian in this life; yet they cannot be encreaſed, but will aſſuredly be abated, by a thorough converſion from ſin to God.

As for an awful *Reverence* of the Divine Majeſty, and a *dread* of incurring his diſpleaſure again, by wilful diſobedience, this ſuffers no diminution, but is rather augmented by the New birth. But that *fear of Hell*, which is diſtinguiſh from the *hope* of Heaven, muſt in reaſon be leſs troubleſome to a true Convert than it was at firſt; and as his *Hopes* grow bigger, of neceſſity his *Fears* muſt be leſs.

In like manner, although an *ingenuous ſham* and *ſorrowful* remembrance of ſins paſt, in proportion to their Number, Kinds, and Aggravations, is never to be put off in this world; yet he that ſincerely forſakes them, will by degrees exchange that *bitter anguiſh*, which ariſes from Guilt, and the apprehenſion of Gods juſt anger, for the Glad teſtimonies of a good Conſcience, and the Joys of the Holy Ghoſt.

Other preparatory Graces are either good *in themſelves*, or *equally* uſeful in *all* conditions; and therefore he that is born of God, ſtill grows more perfect in them: But *Fear* and *Sorrow* are good onely as *Inſtruments*, and that with *reſpect* to the different circumſtances of our State: And therefore they are to *riſe* or *fall*, according as our condition towards God, is worſe or better, more dangerous or more ſafe.

This exception being premiſed, we may by what

what hath been ſaid diſcern what is the true difference, between the *Prepared* and the *Converted*: *viz.* that the latter is endued with *all* thoſe *Chriſtian Graces* which the other wants; and this is the principal difference; and he is alſo arrived to greater perfection in *thoſe* which are common to both.

This ſeems to me to be the plain truth of the Caſe: And now whether this difference may more properly be call'd, a Difference of *Kinds*, or a Difference of *Degrees onely*, is a Queſtion I ſuppoſe not at all *edifying*; and in particular, the Determination of it would not be uſeful in the leaſt to help a man to diſtinguiſh between Regeneration, and the mere preparations towards it, when he examines his own Spiritual ſtate: For whether the Difference be *Gradual onely*, or *Specifical*, the onely ſure mark of Regeneration, is *Impartiality of Obedience*, in turning from *every* evil Courſe, and keeping *all* the Commandments of God.

Finally, I conceive, there is no ſuch great danger of miſtaking the utmoſt preparations to Regeneration, for Regeneration it ſelf, as the *Doctor* imagines; though 'tis very much to be feared, that many men reſt in a partial Obedience, and that indeed is a very dangerous thing. But the reaſon why they do ſo, is becauſe they are not *duly prepared*, *i. e.* becauſe they want a *meek* and *humble* Spirit, and a *Concern* for *Heaven greater* than all worldly Cares and Deſires: For where theſe *leading* Preparations and Virtues are, they will not ſuffer a man to reſt, till he has *perfected Holineſs in the fear of God.*

SECT.

SECT. 6.

To conclude the Chapter; the ſtudy of this Temper of Mind, is to be recommended more earneſtly; ſince we *may* do *very much towards* the gaining of it.

It will contribute hereunto, to *conſider how much depends upon it*, as being, on the one hand, fruitfull of all other Chriſtian Virtues and Graces, and That, on the other hand, without which we cannot become true Chriſtians. This is what we have ſhewn already.

It will likewiſe contribute to this end, to *conſider* the *Excellence* of this Temper *in it ſelf*. For when we recommend it from its happy Conſequences and Effects; we exhort men to that which, *of it ſelf*, will better their Natures, and ennoble their Minds, and which, *for its own ſake*, is worthy of all approbation. It is true *Wiſdome* to prefer an endleſs Happineſs to come, before the ſhort pleaſures of this world; And the Wiſdom of ſo doing appears in this moſt of all, that although the greater good is *future*, and the leſs *Preſent*, yet we are not prejudiced againſt the former, by the latter; but like *reaſonable* creatures, we judge and determine rightly concerning thoſe things which are of greateſt importance to us, though our Senſes are not affected by them. Again, it ſpeaks an ingenuous Diſpoſition, to be willing to learn, to underſtand eaſily, to reform readily, to lye open to Inſtruction, to love the Truth, and receive it with Meekneſs. It is a Reproach

Reproach to a man to be Froward, Untractable, Ungovernable.

The conſideration of theſe things, is a proper means of gaining a *Meek* Spirit, and a juſt *Concern* for the end of Religion: For as to theſe and the like moral Qualities, we partly *direct* men how to attain them by *moving* and perſwading them to endeavour after them. If by giving them their due Character and Commendation, we can form any mans Minde into the love of them, we have gone a great way to make them his own. Beſides, he will then aſſuredly uſe all other Means proper to gain them.

The next that may be named is, *being converſant in the Scriptures*, (not excluding other good Books, wherein the Word of God is plainly and honeſtly uſed) *and eſpecially in thoſe of the New Teſtament*; where at every turn we ſhall meet either with thoſe Doctrines or Examples, that will inſinuate ſomething of this Temper into our minds.

Wherefore that which hath been ſaid concerning the Neceſſity of this Preparation, muſt not be ſo underſtood, as if it would be utterly unprofitable to read the Scriptures, or to hear any divine Truth without it; but thus, that the reading of the Holy Scriptures, or the uſing of any other means whereby the knowledge of the Goſpel may be communicated to us, will never make us the true Diſciples of *Chriſt*, unleſs they firſt of all imbue our Minds with Meekneſs and Humility, with a teachable and inge-

ingenuous ſpirit, and with an earneſt deſire of Eternal Happineſs.

The Word of God is able to *prepare* us, as well as to *perfect* us in Chriſtianity; and by expelling the Spirit of Pride and Worldlineſs out of our hearts, it lays open the way to farther Perfection.

There were never any Books written, that could even inſpire a man with Meekneſs and the Love of Truth, and Contempt of this World, but the holy Books of the Evangeliſts and Apoſtles. What was ever written, that doth ſo effectually call upon men to raiſe up their minds to an higher and better ſtate than this Life affords? Where can we meet with ſuch plain, unaffected, ſincere deſcriptions of true Virtue and Goodneſs, as theſe Writings have preſented the world withal? Where with ſuch an example of a meek and lowly Spirit, as that which our deareſt Lord hath ſet before us, and was ſo well imitated by his Followers, after his Aſcenſion into Heaven, and the Miſſion of the Holy Ghoſt? Thoſe Books, in which there is an excellent Spirit breathing throughout, being read diligently, and with good purpoſe, ſeldome fail of deſcribing ſomething of their own *Genius* and Temper upon the Minde. Much more will the Holy Scriptures have this effect upon us, which having been delivered to the world at firſt by Inſpired Perſons, and coming more immediately from God himſelf, we may reaſonably hope, that a peculiar Aſſiſtance of the Divine Spirit will accompany the Study and Meditation of them. But the firſt change in our Minds, which they

are

are proper to effect, is by creating in us a lowly opinion of our ſelves, together with an earneſt deſire of that Happineſs, which God himſelf has called us to look after: And where this change is made, there is a ſure Foundation laid for all other *Chriſtian* Perfection.

To theſe Means, we muſt adde *Prayer* to God, that by his good Spirit our hearts may be alwaies thus affected and diſpoſed. Our Saviour himſelf told his Diſciples, *No man can come to me, except the Father which hath ſent me draw him*, John 6. 44. *i. e.* unleſs he is *prepared* to be my Diſciple, by a *good and honeſt Heart*: For *that* we are to underſtand by being *drawn to Chriſt*; which being aſcribed to the *Father*, implies, that this Preparedneſs is the Effect of a Divine Operation upon our Mindes, as I obſerved in the * former *Part*. Now our Saviour by ſhewing us the Fountain of this Grace, hath taught us one way, which muſt be added to all the reſt, by which it may be derived to us, *viz.* that of Imploring the Aſſiſtance of the Holy Spirit; that by a meek and humble temper, and a prevailing deſire of coming into the Kingdom of God; that *by an Honeſt and Good Heart* we may be prepared to hear the Word, to keep it, and to bring forth fruit with Patience.

* Part 1. p. 168. *In another place of the Firſt Part*, viz. p. 100. *this Expreſſion of* Being drawn to Chriſt *is brought in amongſt others that ſignifie* being Regenerated, *as if it were one of them. But the reaſon was, becauſe Dr.* O. *and thoſe of his way take it in that ſence; and the Argument proceeding thereupon was good againſt them. This ſhould have been noted in the place it ſelf, but was however fit to be remembred here, for the repairing of the firſt omiſſion. That which I take to be the true ſence of* being drawn to Chriſt, *you have* p. 168. *of the ſame Part, where I ſhewed, that it ſignifies our* being prepared, *to hear God's Word and to keep it, by an impartial love to the Truth.*

By ſuch means as theſe, the Unprepared may come to a ſtate of Preparedneſs, and thereby to a thorough Converſion from ſin to God.

To Conclude, as the Graces Preparatory to Regeneration are themſelves neceſſary to the ſtate of a regenerate man afterward; ſo the uſe of thoſe Means, whereby we come to be prepared, muſt be continued afterwards too. But it is no diſparagement to any Counſel or Direction, that it ſerves for more good purpoſes, than thoſe for which it is immediately offered: We ſhould rather more willingly and thankfully embrace it, for that reaſon. And ſurely, it is a good encouragment for any underſtanding man to follow the Advice which is here given him, that it is of univerſal Uſe and Benefit, as not only ſhewing him by what means he may make a good beginning in Religion and Godlineſs, but alſo how he may proceed happily, and perſevere therein to the end.

CHAP.

CHAP. III.

Concerning the Spiritual State of man before Regeneration.

SECT. I.

THE Title of Dr. *Owens* Fifth *Chapter* of his Third Book, is, *The Nature, Cauſes, and Means of Regeneration:* But concerning the *Nature* of a Regenerate State, he ſays but very little, and that but in ſuch General terms as theſe, *viz.* that it is *our Deliverance from the State of ſin and Corrupted Nature. And thus*, he ſaith, *all Chriſtians, ſo far as he knows, are agreed.* I hope they are; But yet he pretends juſt before, that *Men have through their Ignorance and Prejudices, falſe Apprehenſions about Regeneration and the Nature of it.* This is ſomewhat ſtrange; but I ſupoſe his meaning is, that *through Ignorance and Prejudice we do not apprehend* the change made by that *Deliverance* to be literally and properly a *New Birth*, and a *New Creation*, and the like. But why we cannot apprehend it, I have endeavoured to give the Doctor a reaſonable account, in the *Chapter* of *Regeneration.* P. 254.

Now that which he contends about all along in this Chapter, is the *Manner* wherein the Holy Spirit produceth this change in us. And this, he confeſſes, I think, towards the beginning of the Chapter, where he ſays, *Our ſole Enquiry,* P. 255.

muſt be after the manner and nature of this work; for the Nature of it, depends on the manner of the working of the Spirit of God herein. By the way, I ſuppoſe he means the *thing wrought*, by the *work*; And then it is not always true, that the *Nature* of the *work* depends on the *Manner* of effecting it: For the thing *wrought* may be the *ſame*, though the *manner* of producing it be *divers*. We are not created in the ſame manner, that our firſt Parents were; and yet we are of the ſame nature with them. 'Tis true in *many* things, that the nature of the work, depends upon the manner of working it; as in things made by art: for if greater care is uſed in the working, the more noble is the work; So if Dr. *Owen* had uſed more care and honeſty in compoſing his Books, his arguments had been clearer and ſtronger, and his concluſions better than they are. 'Tis true likewiſe that God does not expreſs his utmoſt Power, for producing all effects, but ordinarily puts forth ſo much as ſuffices for that effect which is deſigned. And yet ſometimes he produceth that effect by his Omnipotence, which commonly is not produced, but according to the natural courſe of things. Our Saviour healed the ſick in a miraculous manner; but health is the ſame thing, whether it is effected with or without ordinary means. The ſame may be ſaid of the health of the Soul, which conſiſts in righteouſneſs and true holineſs; God, if he pleaſeth, can produce it without means, or if he uſeth any, they may be extraordinary if he pleaſeth; and ſo likewiſe whether the Holy Spirit does work Chriſtian Graces in the hearts of men *reſiſtibly*, or *irreſiſtibly*, this makes no alteration in the *Nature* of the effect, which is ſtill the ſame.

ſame. Had he ſaid, the *Manner of working* depends on the *nature of the Effect*, this had been true in the caſe which I believe he intends: For if the Effect implied in Regeneration, be literally a *New Creature*, I grant the manner of working it, muſt be irreſiſtible; but ſince that ſuppoſition has been diſproved, all the arguments that may be built upon it, will fall to the ground with it.

But though he mentioned the *Nature* of Regeneration in the former paſſage, his *ſole* deſign in this Chapter is to prove that the *manner* of the Spirits Operation in Regeneration, is *irreſiſtible*. I have given you ſome reaſons for the contrary Opinion, in the laſt *Chapter* of the firſt *Part*. And now, becauſe I think the conſequences of the Doctors Opinion are very bad, I ſhall go farther, and examine his Arguments in favour of it. And this the rather, becauſe he pretends that *it was never with ſo much Impotence and Ignorance traduced and reviled, as it is by ſome among our ſelves. For a ſort of men*, ſays he, *we have, who by ſtories of wandring Jews, Rhetorical Declamations, pert Cavillings, and proud Revilings of thoſe who diſſent from them, think to ſcorn, and baniſh Truth out of the world; though they never yet durſt attempt to deal openly and plainly with any one Argument that is pleaded in its defence and confirmation.* P. 255. Very modeſtly ſaid! I ſhall try however, whether this mans Arguments will bear to be *dealt with openly and plainly*; and if they will not, I think he may have ſome reaſon to be aſham'd of his Confidence.

But though he pretends that he is here *beginning*

ginning to *enquire* after the *Manner* of the Regenerating work; yet the truth is, he had fixed his Opinion before, and laboured to prove it in the two foregoing *Chapters*. I would not willingly avoid dealing with *any one* of his Arguments, and therefore I ſhall not take the advantage of the uncertainty of his Method, to begin here; but pick up his Arguments, as well as I can, wherever he has ſcatter'd them.

Indeed, he has managed them ſo confuſedly, that it will be hard to put them into ſuch an Order, as ſhall at once ſave the Reader the trouble of needleſs Repetition, and deprive the Doctor of all pretence, that ſomething has been omitted, which he thought material. I ſhall do the beſt I can to prevent both; and to that end, I think his Arguments will be beſt reduced under theſe three Heads.

1. The Conſideration of Mans Spiritual *ſtate before* Regeneration. 2. The *evil Conſequences* of his Adverſaries Opinion. 3. Some *Teſtimonies of Scripture*, which, as he thinks, directly prove his own.

I ſhall begin with the firſt Head of Arguments, *viz.* The Conſideration of Mans *Spiritual State* before Regeneration: He pretends that the ſtate of Man is ſo corrupted and depraved by the Fall, that it is naturally impoſſible to be renewed otherwiſe, than by an Almighty Irreſiſtible Act regenerating him, and repairing the Image of God in him. And he proves this by ſome deſcriptions of the ſtate of unconverted men, which we finde in the Scripture; *viz.* that it is a ſtate of

of *Darkneſs*, of *Blindneſs*, and of *Death*. For therefore they cannot be Converted, but by an Act of Omnipotence, becauſe nothing leſs than that can create *Light*, and open *the Eyes of the Blinde*, and make the *Dead to live*. This is the whole force of what he ſaies for almoſt fifty Pages together; which being all grounded upon his Interpretation of theſe *Metaphorical* Expreſſions; it might go for a ſufficient Anſwer to allege this:

That we are not to argue from the proper ſignification of *Metaphors*, preſuming upon a perpetual Similitude between *them* and the *things meant* by them; becauſe if they are alike in ſome reſpects, *viz.* in thoſe which are very plain, and agreeable to the ſcope of the place, this is ſufficient to warrant the uſe of them.

But the Doctor has taken it for granted, that the Scope of the Scripture, in uſing thoſe Figurative expreſſions, is to note a like impoſſibility of converting the unconverted, as of making the blinde to ſee, and the dead to live: But this was not to have been *prefumed*, but *proved*, becauſe there are many other reſpects (which the Doctor himſelf cannot deny) in which the Metaphors do very plainly expreſs the ſtate of Unconverted men, as I have ſhewn in the Chapt. of Regeneration. And if thoſe reſpects afford a reaſonable account of theſe Metaphorical Expreſſions; the Doctor cannot prove merely from the Metaphors, that they do likewiſe imply the Impoſſibility of Converſion without an Irreſiſtible Act. Therefore this muſt be ſhewn from the ſcope of the Scripture, where it uſeth theſe

Metaphors, or by proving the Doctrine he would conclude, ſome other way. That he has not done the latter, I ſhall ſhew by examining his other Arguments: And that he has not done the former, will appear by his particular management of this ſort of Argument.

SECT. 2.

By that *Darkneſs* and *Blindneſs* which is ſaid to be in the Unregenerate; he would prove *their Ignorance of Spiritual things*; and by that *Death*, which their ſtate is expreſſed by, *their obſtinacy in ſin*, to be invincible by any Power leſs than Omnipotence.

Let us firſt ſee how he acquits himſelf in the
P. 209. former undertaking. *I ſay then*, ſays he, *that by reaſon of that Vice, Corruption, or Depravation of the Minds of Unregenerate men, which the Scripture calls Darkneſs and Blindneſs, they are not able of themſelves, by their own Reaſons, and Underſtandings, however exerciſed and improved, to diſcern, receive, underſtand or believe ſavingly Spiritual things, or the myſtery of the Goſpel, when and as they are outwardly revealed unto them, without an effectual Powerful work of the Holy Spirit creating, or by his Almighty Power inducing a new ſaving Light into them.* This is the Concluſion to be *proved*, but one would be glad firſt to underſtand it; For the words, as many as they are, require another light beſides their own, to let us into the meaning.

And firſt, the Doctor had done well, to have told us what he means by *underſtanding and believing*

lieving SAVINGLY. For I have ſhewn him in the *Introduction*, that by a *ſaving* underſtanding of the myſteries of the Goſpel, he means ſometimes, underſtanding them according to his notions of them, *i. e.* being of his own Opinion. If this be his meaning here, then he ſuppoſes his Opinions to be *ſaving*; But that they cannot be, if they are not *true*, as I have endeavoured to ſhew that they are not. The Truth is, by a ſaving knowledge or underſtanding, he means ſometimes one thing, and ſometimes another; for elſewhere he ſays, *none* deny unregenerate men *to be capable of a Notional Doctrinal knowledge of* P. 282. *Spiritual things.* Yet, as I have ſhewn, he does frequently make them uncapable even of that knowledge of *his* Spiritual things, that is, of his peculiar opinions.

But if by Spiritual Things, and the Myſtery of the Goſpel, he underſtands the real principles of Chriſtianity, and all points neceſſary to be believed in order to Salvation; ſtill two things may be meant by believing them *Savingly*; and it is not eaſie to underſtand which he intends.

1. To believe the Goſpel *ſavingly*, may ſignifie that belief thereof, which actually puts a man into that State, to which Salvation is promiſed; Now in this ſence no man believes ſavingly, but he whoſe *faith worketh by Love*, bringing his will and affections, and converſation in Obedience to the Goſpel. But if this be the Doctors meaning, then the impoſſibility of believing *ſavingly*, does not ſo much ariſe from that incapacity of the Underſtanding, which he means by *Darkneſs*, as from that depravedneſs of the Will and Affecti-

P. 206. 238. Affections, which he means by *Death*; and ſo he confounds two things which he had, more than once, induſtriouſly diſtinguiſhed, and which he pretends to treat of ſeparately. Therefore I ſhall take no more notice of this ſence, till we come to the ſecond Head, to which it properly belongs.

2. The belief of the Goſpel may be ſaid to be *ſaving*, upon another account, *viz.* as it is a good degree towards the attainment of that State to which Salvation belongs. And it may be call'd a *good degree*, whether, as being the performance of one neceſſary condition, upon which the promiſe of Salvation is ſuſpended; And thus every Chriſtian Grace conſidered by it ſelf, is *ſaving*: Or, as being a principle leading to all other goodneſs and Holineſs, which we want, directing us to our whole Duty, perſwading us to perform it, and making us capable of the aſſiſtance of the Holy Spirit, to enable us for the performance. Therefore if that which puts a man into a good way of coming into a ſavable State, may be ſaid to be *ſaving*; Then the knowledge of the Myſtery of the Goſpel, and an aſſent to the truth thereof, is *ſaving*. And as this knowledge is more or leſs *clear and full*, and this perſwaſion more or leſs *firm*, *particular*, *adviſed*, *conſtant* and *preſent* to the Mind; ſo is it more or leſs *ſaving*, as having greater or leſs power to work all other ſaving effects in a mans mind. But *all* Faith in proportion to its *Degree*, is *ſaving* in the ſence now mentioned.

Now it is in this ſence, that I muſt underſtand the Doctor, when he ſaies, That through the *Dark-*

Darkneſs of the Underſtanding, a man cannot believe *ſavingly*, without an irreſiſtible Illumination of his Minde, by the Holy Spirit; unleſs I would *alſo* confound two Arguments, which are of diſtinct Conſideration.

So that the word *Savingly* ſtands in his Propoſition to no other purpoſe, but to obſcure his meaning; for he might as well have ſaid, that without ſuch an Immediate Illumination, as he contends for, no man can believe the Goſpel *at all*. Since *all* belief of the Goſpel is *ſaving* in that ſence, which the Tenor and Method of his Diſcourſe requires.

But there was good Reaſon, why this Word was to be put into the Concluſion; namely, to caſt a Miſt before the Readers eyes at firſt, that he might not ſo well diſcern the confuſion and inconſiſtency of the Proofs afterward; of which I ſhall give you this Inſtance.

His firſt Argument is taken from *Epheſ.* 4. 17, 18. (the place we ſhall conſider in the next *Sect.*) In commenting upon that Text, he diſtinguiſhes between the *Minde*, the *Underſtanding*, and the *Heart*; ſhewing that the *Minde* is *Naturally* vainly enclin'd, and unſtable, and unapt to direct and fix the thoughts; and that the *Underſtanding* cannot guide the Soul in the choice of its Notions: and from his obſcure talk upon theſe Heads, (which you may ſee if you pleaſe) he concludes, *'Tis in vain to pretend a ſufficiency in the Underſtanding to diſcern Spiritual things, without a Supernatural*, he means, an Irreſiſtible, *Illumination*. But by the Heart (as far as I can underſtand P. 211, 212.

derſtand him) he means the *Will and Affections.* Now ſaies he, *Light is received by the Minde, applyed by the Underſtanding, uſed by the Heart. Upon this, ſaith the Apoſtle, there is* πώρωσις, *blindneſs.* P. 212. *It is not a mere Ignorance or Incomprehenſiveneſs of the Notions of Truth that is intended, but a ſtubborn Reſiſtance of Light and Conviction. An obſtinate and obdurate Hardneſs is upon the Heart, whence it rejects all the Impreſſions that come upon it from Notions of Truth. And on theſe Conſiderations Men themſelves before Converſion are ſaid to be Darkneſs,* Epheſ. 5. 8. And a little farther, *There* P. 213. *is not in ſuch perſons ſo much as any Diſpoſition to receive* S A V I N G *Knowledge, no more than there is a Diſpoſition in darkneſs it ſelf to receive light.*

And now who does not ſee, that notwithſtanding his pretence of the incurable *Blindneſs* of the *Minde* and *Underſtanding*; that they may, by his own confeſſion, be in a very good condition, before the Irreſiſtible Act? For if the *Minde* (according to his ſubtle way of diſtinguiſhing) has *received* Light, and the Underſtanding *applied* it, they ſeem to have done their Parts very well, and there is no need of the Irreſiſtible Power, but to ſubdue the *ſtubborn Heart*, which *reſiſts Light and Conviction*, and *rejects all the Impreſſions that come upon it, from notions of Truth.* And yet he tells us, *Men are ſaid to be Darkneſs upon all theſe* three *Conſiderations, i. e.* becauſe they are ſo only in reſpect of *one.* Nay but in reſpect of *all*, they have not *ſo much as any Diſpoſition to receive* S A V I N G *Knowledge.* But what mean you by *Saving Knowledge?* If you underſtand it in the latter ſence, they have it already;

If

If in the former, you are to blame nothing but the obſtinacy of the Will and Affections, which belongs to the Second Head. So that I think it is plain, he put in this word *ſavingly*, only to ſave himſelf from being underſtood: for till the word is explained, his Diſcourſe is *unintelligible*; and when 'tis explain'd, his Diſcourſe is ſhewn to be either *inconſiſtent* in it ſelf, or *impertinent* to the Concluſion.

But, *Secondly*, in *arguing*, a man ſhould take more care of his expreſſions, than to ſay, That Men are not *of themſelves* able to believe, *&c. without an effectual*, &c. For this implies, that *of themſelves* they are able to underſtand and believe, by being irreſiſtibly made to do ſo; which is ſuch another hard Saying, as that which we meet with more towards the end of this Chapter, viz. *That not only the Act of believing and turning to God is the ſole Work and Effect of irreſiſtible Grace; but alſo, that all Power and Ability for it, properly ſo called, is from Grace alſo.* P. 227. Which is as much as to ſay, God does not only do *all* himſelf, but He helps us to do the *reſt*. The reaſon of which kinde of expreſſions is plain enough, *viz.* To carry on his great deſigne of charging his Adverſaries with *Pelagianiſm*; as if they pretended, that Man may *of himſelf*, without *any Power from Grace, believe and turn to God*. And to this purpoſe he ſlipt away from the Concluſion he had laid down, and ſoften'd it into theſe Terms preſently; *That the Minde of a Man is not able of it ſelf Savingly to receive the Doctrine of the Goſpel, without the ESPECIAL AID* (but before it was the *ALMIGHTY POWER*) *of the Holy Ghoſt.* P. 210. Which is a plain

plain inſinuation of the old Calumny, that we ſay the Conditions of Eternal Life may be performed without the *eſpecial Aid* of the Holy Ghoſt; and that becauſe we deny the neceſſity of an *Almighty* force upon the Mind in order thereunto, as if therefore we pretended that there is no need of any *Supernatural Power*, but that we are able to do them *of our ſelves*.

Other Exceptions might be made, touching the Obſcurity of his Expreſſions in the forementioned Concluſion: But it requires ſuch a ſlaviſh attendance to make ſence of an Author that loves obſcurity, that I ſhall not tye my ſelf and the Reader any longer to it. What hath been already obſerved, might be ſufficient to excuſe us from examining any thing that he has ſaid towards the proof of his firſt Concluſion. But becauſe I am bound *to deal openly and plainly* with his Arguments, I ſhall with all convenient Brevity, let you ſee how he manages them, in the next *Section*.

SECT. 3.

His firſt Argument is grounded upon *Epheſ.* 4. 17, 18. *This I ſay therefore, and teſtifie in the Lord, that you henceforth walk not as other Gentiles walk in the vanity of their Minde, having the Underſtanding darkened, being alienated from the life of God, through the Ignorance that is in them, becauſe of the blindneſs of their heart.* Upon this Text he runs an *Harangue* of ſix Pages long, in P. 210. *&c.* which I have ſought a good while, before I could be well aſſured, which was meant for the *Concluſion*, and what for the *Premiſes*. The

The Concluſion to be proved was, *That without an Almighty Power inducing a New Saving Light, no man can believe ſavingly.* Now the perſons ſpoken of here in this Text, did not believe *at all.* And he ſpeaks now and then, as if it was impoſſible for theſe men to be any thing better than they were, unleſs made ſo by Almighty Grace. Therefore it was impoſſible for them to *believe* without it, and therefore, clearly impoſſible to believe *ſavingly.* This is the faireſt conjecture I can make, towards the finding of an Argument. Again, I obſerve farther, that he pretends the deſigne of the Apoſtle in deſcribing the ſtate of theſe *Gentiles*, to have been this, *viz.* to deſcribe the ſtate of all men by *Nature.* And this is the only Propoſition that is any thing plainly expreſſed, in order to an Argument. Now if there be any Argument at all, I think it muſt be this: *If that ſtate which the Apoſtle here deſcribes, be Natural to All men, before they believe; then no man can believe without an Almighty Operation of the Holy Ghoſt, working Faith in his minde irreſiſtibly. But the former is true: Therefore alſo the latter.*

Now 1. If this be not the ſtate of All men by Nature. And 2. Although it were, if yet it follows not, that this ſtate is unalterable, but by ſuch an Operation as he pretends; then this Text affords him no Argument for his Opinion.

He has, I think, two Reaſons by which he would prove, the *ſtate* here deſcribed, to be *common* to *all* men by *Nature.*

The

The firſt is this: Becauſe *the Apoſtle ſpeaks of the Gentiles on the account of that which is common unto All men by Nature. For he treats of their* P. 210. *Condition with reſpect unto the Faculties of their Minds and Souls, wherein there is, as unto the Life of God, or Spiritual things, no difference naturally among men.* This Argument he dilates upon, two Pages together; or rather he *leaves* it, and falls a declaiming upon the Natural Vanity of the *Minde*, and Blindneſs of the *Heart*. But nothing can deſerve leſs to be called an Argument; For 'tis all one, as if he had ſaid: Becauſe *all* men have *Minds*, *Underſtandings* and *Hearts* by *Nature*, therefore by *nature* all mens *mindes*, &c. are ſuch, as are here deſcribed. Or thus: Becauſe they are *Men* whom the Apoſtle here ſpeaks of, therefore *Naturally all* men are as ignorant, ſenſeleſs, and brutiſh, as thoſe whom he ſpeaks of. He mends the matter much, by adding, That *there is no difference naturally among men, as unto Spiritual things, in reſpect of the Faculties of their Minds and Souls*: For let us grant that Nature has made no ſuch difference between unconverted men, ſurely it does not follow, that therefore there is no ſuch difference at all amongſt them; or, that becauſe ſome of them are almoſt as bad as bad can be, therefore all the reſt are no better.

At this rate of arguing, one may prove all men to be *Believers* by *Nature*; For they that believe, are ſaid to have their *Underſtandings* enlightned: And if this be truly ſaid, then all men are *Naturally* Believers; becauſe it *is ſpoken on the account of that which is common to all men by Nature*,

ture, viz. *the Faculty of Underſtanding, wherein there is as unto Spiritual things no difference Naturally among men.*

His other Reaſon is *that Expoſition which*, as he ſaies, *the whole world, and all things in it, give unto this Text and Teſtimony, concerning the Mindes of Natural Men being under the Power of Vanity.* P. 213. He indeed pretends (as if he laid no great ſtreſs on this) that *it may not be amiſs to divert a little to this Conſideration.* But by his leave, his deſign is to perſwade the Reader, that the Experience of the *whole world* is a plain Argument, that the Character which St. *Paul* gives of thoſe Gentiles, in the forementioned Text, ſutes all that are unconverted. But how doth the Experience of the *whole world* prove this? He tells you, *Almoſt all that we ſee and hear of in the world is altogether vain*; and he reduces the Vanity of the World to *two Heads.* 1. *The Vanity they bring into things that are, and that are either good in themſelves, or at leaſt indifferent*; *ſo men do variouſly corrupt their Buildings, and Habitations, their Trading*, &c. 2. *Men finde out, and as it were create things to be mere Supporters, Countenancers and Nouriſhers of Vanity: Such in Religion are carnal pompous Ceremonies, like thoſe of the Church of* Rome; *and Stage-plays, Mimicks, with innumerable other things of the ſame Nature.* And *it were endleſs but to mention the common Effects of Vanity in the World.* And therefore the *whole world gives a good Expoſition upon St.* Paul's *Text.* That is to ſay, Becauſe there is a great deal of Vanity in the world, therefore the *whole world* is *Naturally* as vain, as *thoſe Gentiles* concerning whom St. *Paul* ſaid, that they walked *in the Vanity of*

their Minde. Yea, they that *create carnal pompous Ceremonies in Religion, like thoſe of the Church of* Rome, (O Sir, *it was not amiſs to divert a little*) are *as vain* as the *Idolatrous Gentiles* were; *yea*, they are alienated from the life of God, through the Ignorance that is in them, becauſe of the Blindneſs of their Hearts. Yes, it muſt needs be ſo; *for new Sins, new Vices, new Vanities break forth continually, and all is from hence, that the Minde of*
P. 214. *man by Nature is altogether vain. The world may alter its ſhape, and the outward appearances of things, &c. but it will ſtill be altogether vain, ſo long as natural uncured Vanity is predominant in the Mindes of men.* And now 'tis as plain as any thing, that the Apoſtle ſpeaks of the common ſtate of Men by Nature, in *Epeſ.* 4. 17.

Only there is a little ſcruple in the way, which the *Doctor* ſhould have removed; and that is this, that theſe *Gentiles*, v. 19. are ſaid to be men, *who being paſt feeling, had given themſelves over unto laſciviouſneſs, to work all uncleanneſs with greedineſs.* For theſe words would ſtrongly tempt a man to think that St. *Paul* was not deſcribing what *all* men are, but what *ſome* men were; not how bad men *muſt needs* be in the mere ſtate of *Nature*, but how degenerate they *may* grow by *Cuſtome in ſin.* The Doctor cannot ſay, that *All* his unconverted, and unbelievers, are *paſt feeling, and had given themſelves over to laſciviouſneſs, to work all uncleanneſs with greedi-*
neſs; For this cannot poſſibly conſiſt with thoſe
P. 216. *Convictions*, and that *much Reformation*, and that *Moral Life*, which in this very Chapter, and under this very Head, he allows to the *Carnal Minde.* But he was wiſe enough to take no notice

tice of this *verſe*, which had it been added to the two former, would have cleared the truth of Dr. *Hammond*'s Paraphraſe upon them; againſt whom he would prove, *that the deſcription given is that of the ſtate of all men by Nature.* I ſhall not expoſe the trifling Exceptions which our Author makes againſt that excellent man's Paraphraſe, but nakedly ſet it down, and proceed. P. 210, 211.

" This I command therefore with all " earneſtneſs, that ye do not any longer live af- " ter the manner of the Heathens, in the vile- " neſs of thoſe practices uſed in their Idol-wor- " ſhips, that long courſe of ſin having blinded " their underſtandings ſo that they ſee not that " which by the light of Nature they are enabled " to ſee, and by that groſs ignorance and ob- " duration of Heart run into all impiety, are far " removed from that life which God and Na- " ture requires of them. And in a kinde of " ſenſeleſneſs, and benummedneſs, yield them- " ſelves up to all ſoftneſs and impurity, to the " committing of all inordinate unnatural ſins of " the Fleſh.

Now whoever would prove from that degeneracy which is common to Mankinde, that an *immediate irreſiſtible* Force upon the Minde, is neceſſary to a ſaving knowledge of God, he muſt have a care not to inſtance preſently in thoſe men who by long continuance in the fouleſt kindes of ſin, are grown habitually, and almoſt deſperately wicked. For theſe being corrupted by their own *choice* and *practice*, much more than by neceſſity of Nature, the difficulty of recovering them muſt not wholly be imputed to the latter, but rather moſtly to the former. And this I

am ſure is the way of the Scripture, as that one place of *Jerem.* 13. 23. may ſhew us. *Can the Æthiopian change his skin, or the leopard his ſpots? then may ye alſo do good, that are accuſtomed to do evil.*

A man may *make himſelf* ſo much more a *childe of the Devil* than he was by *Nature*, and be ſo deeply ſunk into a brutiſh life, that he can hardly eſcape without a Miracle; and ſuch an Almighty impreſſion, as our Author means, may with ſome colour of Reaſon be pretended neceſſary to ſave ſuch a man. But this is no argument, that even thoſe who have not ſinned to that degree, cannot be reſcued otherwiſe; or that no man *can make uſe of that Grace which he can refuſe*, unleſs all men were as bad as the worſt.

Since the Doctor inſiſts upon the malignity of Natural Corruption, to prove the neceſſity of his Irreſiſtible Illumination, he ought to have made good his proof, by inſtancing not in thoſe that are little better than the *worſt*, but in the *beſt* ſort of his Natural men. And I doubt not but he underſtood his duty in this matter well enough: For after he had propounded his Concluſion, he proceeds thus: *Let it be ſuppoſed that the Minde of a man be no way hurt, or impaired by any natural defect, ſuch as doth not attend the*
P. 210. *whole race of Mankinde, but is perſonal onely, and accidental; ſuppoſe it free from contracted habits of Vice, or voluntary Prejudices: yet upon the propoſal of the Doctrines of the Goſpel, with the greateſt evidence and demonſtration of the Truth, it is not able to aſſent unto them ſavingly*, i. e. unleſs the irreſi-

irreſiſtible Operation addes a *new ſaving Light* to the Minde. This indeed promis'd very fairly towards the carrying on of the Argument. But it was a foul diſappointment, to inſtance preſently (for the *evincing of this truth*, as he ſays) in men who were ſo far from being *free from contracted habits of Vice*, that on the other hand they were grown *paſt feeling, and had given themſelves over unto laſciviouſneſs, to work all uncleanneſs with greedineſs.*

But Secondly, admitting it were as true as it is falſe, that *the deſcription given is that of the ſtate of all men by Nature*, it does not preſently follow that the *irreſiſtible* Illumination is neceſſary for any man. For though I deny not that a man may ſin himſelf into ſuch a deſperate ſtate, as to need irreſiſtible Grace for his recovery; and though the condition of *theſe* Gentiles was exceedingly bad, yet it cannot from hence be concluded that it was ſo bad, as to render them incurable by any other means. I do not know but men may grow to ſuch a degree of incorrigibleneſs; but God onely knows when a man is come to this paſs; and every wilful ſinner ſhould tremble to make one ſtep nearer to it, and forthwith endeavour to retire at the greateſt diſtance from it.

Now it is neither ſaid in this place of Saint *Paul*, or in any part of the Context, that theſe men were *ſo* degenerate, that they were incapable to be wrought upon any other way than by an irreſiſtible Illumination: Nor is any ſuch thing implied in the Metaphorical Expreſſions of *Darkneſs, Blindneſs*, &c. This cannot be preten-

ded, without taking the liberty of arguing from Metaphors without any limitation, which I have ſhewn is very unreaſonable. Finally, it cannot be proved from the ſcope of the Apoſtle in this place, ſince the ſuppoſition thereof was not at all needful to contribute to his purpoſe.

His purpoſe was to diſſwade the Chriſtians from imitating the manners of the Heathens. *This I ſay therefore, and teſtifie in the Lord, that ye walk not as other Gentiles walk in the vanity of their minde.* To enforce this Exhortation, he uſeth two Arguments; the former, that of the ſtate of the Heathens, who being hardned in their other vices by their Idolatries, were generally a ſort of men that had loſt all ſenſe of true Religion and Virtue, and were as debauched in their Principles, as they were diſſolute in their Manners and Practices: and ſurely the examples and cuſtoms of ſuch men as theſe, were not fit for imitation. His latter Argument was the condition of the *Chriſtians* themſelves, who had been better inſtructed, even by the Revelation of the Son of God: *But ye have not ſo learned Chriſt; if ſo be that ye have heard him, and have been taught by him, as the truth is in Jeſus*, v. 20, 21, *i. e.* ye, of all men, would be moſt inexcuſable, if you ſhould follow ſuch vile examples, who have had the advantage to be inſtructed in the Doctrine of *Chriſt*, which has ſo clearly diſcovered how abominable their errours and vices are. And you cannot be more ſure that you have been taught the *Truth*, as it was revealed by *Jeſus*, than that it requires you to lead a converſation contrary to theirs.

If

If this was the ſcope of the *Apoſtle*, it does not require the Doctor's ſuppoſition, that the *Gentiles* were incurable, but by an irreſiſtible Illumination. For ſuppoſing the contrary, *his* former Reaſon remains in full force, why they were not to be imitated, *viz.* becauſe they were groſly ignorant, and foully debauched perſons.

In a word, if the Doctor had thought in good earneſt that his Concluſion was *implied* in this place of Saint *Paul*, I doubt not but he would have found room in ſix *Pages* of common place upon the Text to ſhew *how* it was implied: But I think it was more wiſely done to let it alone. Onely the man or his Cauſe muſt greatly want Arguments, if he be forced to ſeek relief from one ſo unlikely to afford it as this is.

His ſecond Argument is grounded upon 1 *Cor.* 2. 14. *The natural man receiveth not*, &c. his expoſition of which Text, I thought needful to examine in the *Introduction*, for the preventing of that deſign of his in expounding this Text, *viz.* to perſwade his Readers that none but he and his Party could underſtand ſpiritual things *ſpiritually*. For I ſhewed from ſeveral paſſages of his own, that this was his great aim, while he pretended to prove the neceſſity of his irreſiſtible Illumination from the Text. But having for that reaſon ſhewn him already that St. *Paul* is not for his turn there, I have ſaved the Reader all that trouble in this place.

I think theſe are all his Arguments for the proving of his firſt Concluſion; for thus he proceeds: P. 227. *Having cleared the impotency to diſcern ſpiritual things ſpiritually that is in the Mindes of natural men, by reaſon of their ſpiritual blindneſs, or that darkneſs which is in them; it remains that we conſider what is the power and efficacy of this darkneſs to keep them in a conſtant and unconquerable averſation from God and the Goſpel.*

Here he ſeems to advance to a ſecond Concluſion, *viz.* that as the *Darkneſs* or Ignorance of natural men is incurable, but by irreſiſtible Illumination of the Underſtanding; ſo, *that averſation from God which is the effect of this ignorance, is* alſo *unconquerable* but by an irreſiſtible force upon the Will and Affections.

Now if the Doctor makes the *unconquerableneſs* of this *averſation* to depend upon the *incurableneſs* of that Ignorance; then if the Ignorance be not incurable, it follows that the averſation is not unconquerable otherwiſe than by an Almighty force upon the Minde. And therefore whatever Arguments he can bring to prove, that ſo long as this darkneſs remains, the Minde is alienated from God, and cannot ſubmit to his Law; they are all vainly ſpent. For I willingly grant, that while a man is ſo *ignorant* as he ſuppoſes his Natural man to be; he cannot poſſibly be *good*. And I believe he himſelf will ſay, that God does not interpoſe an irreſiſtible Operation for the renewing of a mans Will and Affections, before he has enlightened his Underſtanding. And yet all that he would prove, is in effect, that the

the Heart cannot be made good but by an Almighty operation, ſo long as the natural darkneſs of the Underſtanding remains.

And this he proves, 1. By *Coloſſ.* 1. 13. where the converted Gentiles *are ſaid to be delivered from the power of darkneſs*, i. e. according to him, from that power whereby the *darkneſs of their Mindes did naturally produce* other ſins. But ſure they were delivered from that darkneſs it ſelf too; and whereas 'tis ſaid *they were delivered* from it, it does not follow from that ſaying, that it was impoſſible for them to have hindred that deliverance, which is the darling opinion he contends for all along. 2. He proves it by the effects of the Devils darkneſs: For, ſays he, *the Angels who ſinned are kept unto Judgement under chains of darkneſs*, 2 Pet. 2. 4. The ſum of what he ſays upon this place with any ſhow of pertinence, is this: That *it is alone from their own darkneſs, in the Chains whereof they are bound, that they cannot but continue in their courſe of Rebellion; and this Darkneſs is no leſs effectual to binde natural man in a ſtate of ſin, without the powerful Illumination* which he means, *than it is in the Devils themſelves.* I perceive any Text in the Scripture where the word *Darkneſs* is, eſpecially if *Chains*, or *Power*, or ſome ſuch expreſſion be added to it, will ſerve his turn. But this is not *reaſoning* upon the Scriptures, but moſt extravagant *canting*; ſo extravagant, that it does not afford occaſion for the ſtarting of one profitable or ſavory thought pertinent to the Queſtion in hand.

P. 227.

P. 228.

But he farther ſhews the *Efficacy* of this Darkneſs

neſs to keep men in an unconquerable averſation from God and the Goſpel, in ſome *Inſtances* of its efficacy ſo to do. First, *It fills the Minde* P. 228. *with enmity againſt God, and all the things of God.* Coloſſ. 1. 21. *You were enemies in your minder.* Rom. 8. 7. *The carnal minde is enmity againſt God; it is not ſubject unto the law of God, neither indeed can be.* And ſo if you had, pleaſed, the *unconquerable Averſation* might have been made an inſtance of *Enmity*: For as you order the matter, you make no difference between them, but come over again with the ſame things we had before, excepting only an impertinent Digreſſion againſt thoſe, I know not who, that ſay P. 230. we *can love God without ſupernatural Revelation, and other aids of Grace:* and likewiſe your ſaying that by reaſon of this Darkneſs, *the practical notions which men have of God tend to alienate their Hearts from him,* and *thereby they are made obſtinate in their ſin to the uttermoſt.* But you write ſo looſely and uncertainly, that unleſs you will pleaſe to ſay whether you think the *Ignorance* to be incurable becauſe it fills the Minde with *Enmity*; or the Enmity, becauſe 'tis the fruit of Ignorance, or what elſe it is that you mean; what you would prove, and how you prove it: unleſs this be done, I am not obliged either to contradict, or yeild to what you ſay.

You tell us from the Apoſtle, that *The carnal minde is enmity againſt God; it is not ſubject unto the law of God, neither indeed can be.* Your deſign I know is to prove from hence the neceſſity of your *irreſiſtible Operation*; but you tell us not where the conſequence lies. You will not I hope be ſo vain as to ſay, that the carnal Minde carnal

cannot, without an Almighty work upon it, be reconciled to God, and made ſubject to his Law, while it continues to be carnal; as if this were the ſence of the place: For that the Minde ſhould be *carnal*, and at the ſame time *ſubject to the Law* of God, are contradictions; and to make Contradictions true, does not fall under *any power*, and therefore not under *Almightineſs*. Therefore I think you muſt ſay, that the Minde which is now *carnal*, cannot become *ſpiritual* and holy afterward, otherwiſe than by ſuch a manner of Operation as you pretend. But I challenge you to ſhew any conſequence by which this can be concluded from the Text.

Beſides, I underſtand not, nor have you ſhewn how this Text may be managed to prove what you ſay concerning the *Darkneſs* of a mans Minde by *Nature*, and the *efficacy* thereof.

And now, Sir, I cannot but intreat you, as Mr. *Chillingworth* did Father *Knot* the *Jeſuite*, that the next time you write, you would pleaſe to write all in *Syllogiſms*, that you may be the better able to keep your ſelf within the compaſs of *Method* and *Senſe*: And above all, when you cite a Text of Scripture, to tell us expreſly the Concluſion you would prove from it; and then form your Argument out of the Text. For you tell us in the cloſe of this firſt Inſtance, that *one Teſtimony of Scripture will be of more weight with the Diſciples of Jeſus Chriſt, than a thouſand Declamations to the contrary.* You ſay well; and therefore if you make your Proofs from Scripture plain and evident, you are ſafe enough. But now if you bring a place of Scripture without P. 231.

acquain-

acquainting us *what* you bring it to *teſtifie*, and *how* that is *teſtified* by it; you muſt not ſay that the *Teſtimony* of the holy Text is on your ſide; but if you are reſolved to ſay ſo however, you will finde that *the Diſciples of Jeſus Chriſt* are not *all* of 'em ſuch fools as to believe it.

Beſides, you ſhould be the more careful of your *Proofs*, becauſe, as you ſay in this place, Ibid. *Some are in theſe days ſo apt to boaſt in proud ſwelling words of vanity, concerning the power and ſufficiency of the Minde, even with reſpect unto Religion and Spiritual things.* For my part, I know not where theſe *proud* men have lived all this while; but if you know of any ſuch, I doubt they will *boaſt* on ſtill for any thing you have to ſay to 'em, unleſs you make a great Reformation in your way of writing.

Secondly, *This Darkneſs fills the Minde with Wills or perverſe Luſts, that are directly contrary to the Will of God*; which is but ſaying over your firſt *Inſtance*, as you call it, in other words; *viz.* that it *alienated* the Minde from God, *filling it with enmity againſt God and all the things of God.*

From hence you proceed to an Obljection that you ſay will be made, *viz.* That this Impiety does not ſo much argue the *impotency of the Underſtanding*, as the depravedneſs of the *Will and Affections:* that is the ſum of the Objection. To which you anſwer,

P. 231, 232. *We do not now diſcourſe concerning the weakneſs and diſability of the Minde in and about theſe things, which is, as it were, a natural impotency*

like

like blindneſs in the Eyes, which hath been both explained and confirmed before. But it is a moral diſability, and that as unto all the powers of Nature invincible, as unto the right receiving of ſpiritual things, which enſues on that corrupt depravation of the Minde in the ſtate of Nature, that the Scripture calls Darkneſs, or Blindneſs, which we intend. Now Sir, I aſſure you that I ſhould never have made that exception; for ſo long as you ſuppoſe the *natural* man's Underſtanding to be ſo ſottiſh and incapable as you make it, you have no reaſon to expect any good from the *Will* and *Affections*. But whether the Objection were ſeaſonable or not, do you think in your Conſcience that any man can be obliged ſo much as to underſtand this obſcure ſtuff, which you call an Anſwer to it? Had you not confounded thoſe terms *Natural* and *Moral*, with an inſignificant multitude of words, one would have gueſt your meaning to be this, that a man neither *can* nor *will* underſtand Goſpel-truths aright without your *New Light*; and then, I think, the reſt you would have ſaid is this, that the reaſon why he *will not*, is becauſe he *cannot*; it is naturally impoſſible for him, and therefore he is invincibly reſolved to let it alone. And if this be true, he has as good an excuſe for himſelf as he needs to deſire.

But when you ſay we *do not here diſcourſe of the natural impotency of the Minde*, if your meaning be, that the wickedneſs of the unregenerate does not proceed from that, but from a *moral* weakneſs, or the depravedneſs of the Affections; then you plainly yield to the Objection which you pretend to anſwer. If this be not your meaning,

meaning, *Natural* and *Moral* are oppoſed to no purpoſe. But I believe if you would come out of the Clouds, you would anſwer thus; that the reaſon why the wicked are incorrigible, is becauſe their ignorance is invincible, as I gueſt at firſt.

But I think you plainly contradict all this in your third Inſtance of the Efficacy of this Darkneſs, *viz.* That it *fills the Minde with Prejudices* P. 232. *againſt ſpiritual things as propoſed unto them in the Goſpel*; (which it muſt needs do, if it *had* filled the Minde with *enmity* againſt them before.) For P. 233. one of theſe prejudices is this; That *at firſt view men judge that ſpiritual things will not affect them in the purſuit or improvement of their carnal Satisfactions.* And you your ſelf confeſs, that *ſo far they are in the right, they judge not amiſs. The things of the Goſpel will give neither Countenance nor Help to the Luſts of men. Nay, it is no hard matter for them to diſcern, that the Goſpel being admitted in the power of it, will crucifie and mortifie their corrupt Affections.* And not long after you tell us, that *this Prejudice becomes invincible in their Souls. They neither do, nor can not will admit of thoſe things which are utterly inconſiſtent with all things wherein they hope or look for ſatisfaction.* To make ſence of which words, it is neceſſary to underſtand, *not ſubmitting* to the Doctrine of the Goſpel, by *not admitting* it. For *at firſt view, the Underſtanding* has done its part well, by judging concerning the Doctrine of the Goſpel, that it will not give a man leave to live wickedly; and that if *it be admitted in the power of it, it will crucifie corrupt Affections.* But how the *eaſe* wherewith the natural man apprehends this,

this, can be reconciled with *the disability of his Understanding about spiritual things, which is as it were a natural impotency like blindness in the Eyes*, not to be cured but by an act of Almightiness, I desire you to inform me. For he has such a *right* knowledge of the designe of the Gospel *at first view*, as implies the knowledge of a great many particulars under it; and by the same reason that he has gone thus far without your irresistible Illumination, and *not judged amiss*, but very *right* by your own confession, I think he may go farther, and *not judge amiss* concerning more spiritual things, and that without your *New Light*.

But you say, *the Minde by this Darkness is filled with prejudices against the mystery of the Gospel in a peculiar manner*, i. e. as you explain your self, against those Doctrines of the Gospel which are known by *Revelation*. And the natural man cannot come up so far as to receive these, without your *New Light*. Of this I have already told you my minde in the Introduction; onely I cannot but wonder at your uncharitableness, in bringing your Adversaries in as instances of the truth of what you say: For 'tis plain enough that you speak of them, when you say, that *resolving to give unto moral Duties the preheminence in all things, some of them do in a manner wholly despise the peculiar Doctrines of the Gospel, reproaching those by whom they are singularly professed, and that they reject them as unintelligible or unnecessary*. It is an *unchristian* thing to let fly your reproaches thus at random against persons that, I perceive, you have no acquaintance with. I challenge you to instance in any one

P. 234.

P. 235.

of

of the Clergy of this Church that has deſerved this odious Character. If you can prove your Charge, you will preſently hear that the guilty are admoniſht to *repent*; but if you cannot, *you* are in duty bound to make *us* amends, by *retracting* your raſh and ſcandalous words againſt us.

But to return to the Argument: That which you have pretended to prove by your Inſtances, if I am not miſtaken, is this; that by reaſon of that invincible Ignorance of the Underſtanding, which you ſay is called *Darkneſs* in the Scripture, the Will and Affections are incorrigibly naught. And this ſeems to be your meaning by what you ſay towards the concluſion of this Chapter, *viz.* That *the Minde may be conſidered two ways.* 1. *As it is Theoretical or Contemplative; and thus it is the duty of the Minde to apprehend, underſtand, and receive the Truths of the Goſpel as they are propoſed unto it, in the manner of, and unto the end of their propoſal: and this it neither doth, nor is able to do,* becauſe of its Darkneſs. *That receiving* of Truth in the *manner* of its propoſal, is very obſcure; and *receiving* it unto the *end* of its propoſal, is obſcure likewiſe; unleſs you mean Holineſs and Obedience by the *end*, and then it belongs to the ſecond Conſideration of the Minde, as it is, you ſay, *practical.* Now 'tis very well ſaid of you, that *the good which the Minde cannot diſcover, the Will cannot chuſe, nor the Affections cleave unto.* Therefore if the Minde be invincibly ignorant of the good propounded in the Goſpel, the *Will* cannot poſſibly *chuſe* it, *&c.* Now, Sir, you have had my Anſwer to this already, *viz.* that you have not proved

P. 236.

P. 237.

proved the Darkneſs or Ignorance of the Underſtanding, to be ſo incurable as you pretend it is; and therefore this other Concluſion of the incorrigibleneſs of the Will, without your New Light, and irreſiſtible Grace, is not to be built upon it.

This anſwer might have ſaved us the trouble of going through your *Inſtances*, onely I was willing to ſee whether they might not give ſome light to your meaning, if not any ſtrength to your Argument; and this the rather, becauſe I have undertaken to *deal openly and plainly* with you as we go along. P. 255.

But to help you to clear your ſelf, I ask whether you would have one irreſiſtible act upon the *Underſtanding onely*, upon which the obedience of the Will and Affections follows; or a ſecond irreſiſtible act immediately upon the *Will after the illuminating* of the Minde. Sometimes I think the latter to be your meaning, becauſe you require an Almighty power to raiſe man from his ſtate of *Death*, which you diſtinguiſh from *Darkneſs*. If you mean thus, then you ought to have proved, Firſt, that after the *Underſtanding* is delivered from *Darkneſs* by an irreſiſtible Illumination, yet ſtill the *Will* is in a ſtate of *Death*; and this although you acknowledge this Illumination to be a principle of life; that is, you were bound to prove that there is death where there is a principle of life. Secondly, That after this irreſiſtible act upon the Underſtanding, there muſt be *another irreſiſtible act* to quicken the Will; that is, that there is a *double creature* in Regeneration. But if theſe things

are not diſtinct, then *Death* and *Darkneſs* are but one thing, and the *giving of light*, is alſo *raiſing from the dead*; and then your ſecond diſcourſe is in vain, being about another expreſſion of the ſame thing: And if they mean the ſame thing, they are but figurative Expreſſions, and you are to remember that, when you argue from them.

I do not know that I have omitted the conſideration of any paſſage in your whole Chapter which would have mended the matter; but I have ſlipt a very plentiful number, which, if my deſigne had been to expoſe your want of Method, and Clearneſs, and Conſiſtency, would have tempted me to keep you here longer than I have done.

And yet the Reflections you have made upon your Adverſaries in this Chapter are ſo full of bitterneſs, that you could not expect any thing leſs than to be requited by them, at leaſt with a juſt ſeverity upon your ſelf; unleſs the indecency of your Reproaches ſhould chance to make them loath all *ſharpneſs* whatſoever, though againſt Dr. *Owen* himſelf.

When you were reflecting upon thoſe *their* Diſcourſes concerning the reaſonableneſs and excellency of Goſpel-Truths, which you it ſeems do not like, why muſt you preſently ſay, *that* P. 233. 234. *none for the moſt part give a greater evidence of the prevalency of the darkneſs and enmity that is in carnal Mindes againſt the ſpiritual things of the Goſpel, as to their Life and Power, than thoſe who pride and pleaſe themſelves in ſuch Diſcourſes?* and not long after, that the *myſteries* of the Goſpel

ſpel are *Fanatical*, *Chimerical*, *and fooliſh to them*; and that *ſome*, you know who, *do*, *as we ſee*, *with the greateſt pride*, *ſcorn*, *and contempt imaginable*, *deſpiſe the Purity*, *Simplicity*, *and whole Myſtery of the Goſpel*, *who yet profeſs they believe it*; and that *by advancing morality above the myſtery of the Goſpel*, *they at once reject the Goſpel*, *and deſtroy Morality alſo*,----- *whereof the converſation of the men of this perſwaſion is no ſmall evidence.* Thus you tell the world in words at length, that we are a company of notorious Hypocrites, who neither believe the *Goſpel* which we profeſs, nor practiſe that *Morality* which we commend, but in very deed are no better than *Debauched Infidels*. P. 236.

As for our *Converſation*, I ſhall ſay nothing to it, becauſe they that either know *us* or *you*, will think never the worſe of us in this reſpect, for the ſake of your Reproaches. And as for *our Opinions*, I believe no man who reads your Book with an ordinary Underſtanding, will conclude them to be *Paganiſh*, merely becauſe you ſay ſo; unleſs you ſhew more judgement in proving your own, than you have done in this Chapter.

You may poſſibly be miſtaken by ſome or other for a great Champion of the Truth, becauſe you fall foul upon all that are not of your Opinion; but whoever ſhall conſider what little reaſon there is for it, will rather gueſs that your *Huffing* is to counterfeit an aſſurance of *your ſelf*, and your *Cauſe*, while in good earneſt you were afraid of a Trial.

SECT. 4.

P. 238. From the *Darkneſs* of unregenerate Minds, the Doctor proceeds to argue from their being *ſpiritually dead*, which he ſaies, *principally reſpects their Wills and Affections.* The concluſion he undertakes to prove is this; That *by reaſon of that*
P. 239. *ſpiritual death that is in unregenerate men, they are utterly diſabled from doing any thing that is ſpiritually good, until they are quickned by the Almighty Power, and irreſiſtible Efficacy of the Holy Ghoſt.*

His Argument to prove this, is contained in theſe words, though he does not bring them
P. 242. in the form of an Argument: *It is with them as to all the acts and ends of life ſpiritual, as it is with the Body as to the acts and ends of life natural when the Soul is departed from it.*

But before he came to theſe words, he had taken pains to prove, that a dead Body has nei-
P. 240. §. 5. ther any *principle of life*, nor *actions* of life, nor any *Power* to do any vital actions, nor any *active* power to *diſpoſe* it ſelf to live. To bring things to this paſs, he was fain to go about, and begin with the definition of the *life of a living Creature*; which, as he ſays, is *Actus Vivificantis in*
P. 239. *Vivificatum, per unionem utriuſque.* That is to ſay, *The life of a Creature that has life, is the act of that which makes to live upon that which is made to live, by the Union of both.*

Now that which makes to live, or the *Principle of Life* in man, he tells us, is *the rational Soul*; and

and this being united to the Body, makes it live; and when the body lives, it can *move* and *feel*, and the like. *And hence it is evident wherein death* P. 240. *Natural doth consist*, viz. *in the separation of the Soul from the Body*; for the Soul *operates onely by vertue of its Union*, therefore being separated, the Body has no *principle of life*, nor *vital actings*, and so forth, as you heard before.

From these things, saith he, *we may by a just analogie collect wherein Life and Death Spiritual doth consist.* Now the *Analogie* in short is this; that in Life Spiritual the Soul is the subject *quickened*; and in course there must be a *quickening principle*, as the Soul is to the Body. He speaks much of it here, but he does not tell us what it is; and I think he needed not, because we heard *what* it was some time before, *viz. A new Crea-* P. 183. *ture that hath a being and subsistence of its own in the Soul:* Such a like quickning principle the Soul of *Adam* had in his innocency, and we all lost it by the Fall. Now the principle of Life being separated from the Soul, the Soul is spiritually dead; and in this Death there are three things. 1. *A Privation of a principle of Spiritual life.* 2. *A Negation of all Spiritual Vital Acts.* P. 242. 3. *A total want of Power for any such Acts whatever.* And because these things hit so exactly with *Death Natural*, therefore also, as in a dead body, there remains onely a *Potentia Obedientialis*, P. 240. a *passive power to receive Life again*, i. e. if an Almighty Power unites the *Soul* to it again: So the dead *Soul* hath such a power, and no more, not being able to do any thing that is spiritually good, till the *New Creature*, the *Quickning Principle*, be *superinduced* by the *irresistible Efficacy of*

the Holy Ghoſt. This is the ſum of a great deal that he has ſaid to this purpoſe with much oſtentation of Art and Learning.

But I think a man muſt be hard put to it that is fain to build a Concluſion upon ſuch a fanciful *Analogie* as this. If nothing elſe could be ſaid, the Concluſion would be in great danger, by advancing another notion of the *death* of the *Body* againſt the Doctors. What if one ſhould queſtion his *Philoſophy* in making *death Natural*, as he calls it, to conſiſt in the ſeparation of the Soul from the Body, or in making that ſeparation to be the *cauſe* of the death of the Body? This is not ſo certain as he imagines; for the principle of the bodily Life (for any thing we know) may be purely *Mechanical*, conſiſting of the regular Conformation and Motion of ſome principal *Organs*, which belong to the Structure of the Body. If this be true, then Death Natural conſiſts in the deſtruction of the *Mechaniſm* of the Body; and by conſequence *Life* is *antecedent* to the *Union* of the Soul and Body, and *Death* to the *ſeparation* between them. Now if there be no neceſſity of a *ſubſiſtence* diſtinct from the Body, to cauſe bodily Life; then he cannot by *Analogie* conclude the neceſſity of a *being ſuperinduced into the eſſential Faculties of the Soul*, to cauſe Life Spiritual. A man ought to be very ſure of his *Natural Philoſophy*, that by *Analogie* thereunto would prove his opinion in Divinity. And I doubt the Doctors *Philoſophy* will not reach ſo far, as to demonſtrate even the *Improbability* of this *Hypotheſis*.

Beſides, Arguments grounded upon *Analogies*, and

and *Similitudes*, though never ſo ſquare and pat, are of all others the leaſt convincing; they may incline the Underſtanding, but they are not fit to *ſatisfie* it: They will not always hold, when they proceed by Analogie from one *ſpiritual* thing to another; but they are ever weak and uncertain, when we argue analogically from ſuppoſitions in *Natural* Philoſophy, to eſtabliſh Concluſions in Divinity.

But when all is done, if the Doctor had not been fond of ſhewing his skill; without fetching ſuch a compaſs, he might have come roundly up to the point, as he does at laſt, when he tells us, that *it is with unregenerate Mindes as to Life Spiritual, as it is with a dead Body as to life Natural:* For, let the *Philoſophical* account of *Life* and *Death* be what it will, we all know that a dead Body cannot be reſtored to Life, but by an Almighty act. And if it be with unregenerate Men as to all purpoſes of Spiritual Life, as it is with a dead Body as to Life Natural; the *conſequence* is very good, that they cannot be converted but by an act of irreſiſtible Efficacy, ſuch as that *Phyſical* act is which the Doctor contends for. P. 242.

But how does he prove the Suppoſition? He proves it very briefly thus; *Why elſe are they ſaid to be dead?* and this is every ſyllable of proof that he offers for it; ſo that the whole ſtreſs of this Argument lies upon the uſe of a *Metaphorical* Expreſſion, as he himſelf confeſſes it to be. P. 242. P. 239.

Now the Argument implied in his Queſtion muſt proceed upon one of two Suppoſitions,

whereof the firſt is this, That it is lawful to argue from the whole latitude of this Metaphorical expreſſion, ſo as to conclude any thing true concerning the *Unregenerate*, which may properly be affirmed of the *Dead*. I have already ſhewn that there is no reaſon for this: a dead *Body* is void of all *ſenſe*; but the unregenerate man under *Convictions*, &c. is not without *all* ſpiritual ſenſe; and yet he is *ſaid to be Dead*. It is abſurd to perſwade a *dead* Body to live: It is on the other hand very congruous to perſwade the Unregenerate to convert; and yet he is *ſaid to be Dead*. And there are a great many more Inſtances, wherein the Argument from the Metaphor will not hold.

The ſecond Suppoſition is, That no other reaſon can be given why the *Unregenerate* are ſaid to be *Dead*, but becauſe a dead Body cannot be reſtored to life but by an Almighty act. If this were true, then it would follow indeed that the efficacy of the Holy Ghoſt in converting a ſinner is irreſiſtible; becauſe the holy Scripture doth not uſe *inſignificant Metaphors*. But I have already ſhewn the Doctor that there are other reſpects, and thoſe very obvious and plain, in which the ſtate of Unregeneracy does agree with that of Death [*Part* 1. *p.* 141. *&c.*] and in thoſe reſpects the Unregenerate may be *ſaid to be Dead*, though not in this which he contends for.

His Argument therefore does not conclude the thing in queſtion, ſeeing both thoſe Suppoſitions are falſe, upon one of which it muſt neceſſarily proceed.

But

But I ſhall farther ſhew him, that the impoſſibility of being converted, or doing any ſpiritual good, otherwiſe than by the intervention of an *irreſiſtible* cauſe, cannot be argued from hence, that the Unconverted are ſaid to be in a ſtate of death, whatever elſe may be argued from it. There are ſeveral Arguments by which this may be proved; I ſhall uſe but one, and that is this:

If from the proper ſignification of *Death* it may be concluded that the Unregenerate can contribute nothing to their own converſion, but muſt be converted (if at all) by the ſame power that is neceſſary to raiſe the dead to life; then from the proper ſignification of that word, it may be concluded that the Regenerate cannot ſin, nor contribute any thing towards their committing ſin: But this latter cannot be concluded from the propriety ofthat word, therefore not the former.

The Doctor will not ſay that the Regenerate cannot ſin, and fail of their duty; therefore the Conſequence onely remains to be proved; and that I prove thus:

As the Unregenerate are ſaid to be *dead in ſin*, ſo the Regenerate are ſaid to be *dead to ſin*, *Rom.* 6. 2, 8, 11. 1 *Pet.* 2. 24. therefore if the former expreſſion implies an impoſſibility of conferring any thing towards Converſion, and of being converted but by the ſame Power which can raiſe the dead, it follows that the latter expreſſion implies *ſuch* an impoſſibility of committing ſin: For the reaſon in both caſes is the ſame;

ſame; which is the proper ſignification of the ſame word.

There are other Arguments which might be offered, ſome of which the Doctor himſelf hath brought in by way of Objection againſt his Opinion: I ſhall tranſcribe the Objections, and conſider his Anſwers to 'em.

SECT. 5.

It will be objected, ſaith he, *and hath againſt this Doctrine been ever ſo, ſince the days of* Pelagius, *that a ſuppoſition hereof renders all Exhortations, Commands, Promiſes, and Threatnings, which compriſe the whole way of the external Communication*
P. 244. *of the Will of God, vain and uſeleſs. For to what purpoſe is it to exhort blinde men to ſee, or dead men to live, or to promiſe Rewards unto them upon their ſo doing? Should Men thus deal with ſtones, would it not be vain and ludicrous, and that becauſe of their impotency to comply with any ſuch Propoſals of our Minde unto them? And the ſame is here ſuppoſed in Men as to any Ability in Spiritual things.*

The *Doctrine* which this Objection is made againſt, is not ſo old as from the *days of* Pelagius; and the Doctrine contrary to it, was the Doctrine of the Church all along before *the days of* Pelagius, as I intend to ſhew hereafter, with Gods aſſiſtance. But as for the charge of *Pelagianiſm*, which here you inſinuate againſt *us*, I pray forget not, that I have not onely cleared our ſelves from it, but proved it againſt you,

[*Part*

[*Part* 1. *p.* 133.] Setting this aſide, the Objection is fairly enough ſtated; and I cannot but commend the Doctors courage to look it in the face: But let us ſee whether his skill and ſtrength to remove it be anſwerable or not.

He anſwers 1. That *there is nothing in the higheſt wiſdom required in the application of any means to the producing of an Effect, but that in their own Nature they are ſuited thereunto; and that the Subject to be wrought upon by them, is capable of being affected according as their Nature requires. And thus Exhortations with Promiſes and Threatnings, are in their kinde as moral Inſtruments ſuited and proper to produce the effects of Faith and Obedience in the Mindes of Men. And the Faculties of their Souls, their Underſtandings, Wills and Affections, are meet to be wrought upon by them unto that end: For by mens rational Abilities they are able to diſcern their Nature, and judge of their Tendency.*

To this I ſay, that the Doctor does but repeat that Objection here in other words, which he ſhould have anſwered: For the Objection is this, That his Opinion being ſuppoſed, *the Wills and Affections of men are not meet to be wrought upon by Exhortations* to Converſion, *with Promiſes and Threatnings, nor capable of being affected according as the nature of thoſe means requires.* But it is a ſtrange way of anſwering this Objection, to ſay, that the Wills of men are capable of being *ſo* affected: For if they are *capable*, if they are meet to be wrought upon by Exhortations to Faith and Obedience, in order to *this end*, as the Doctor ſaies they are; then they are capable

ble of being converted by another kinde of Power than that which raiſes the dead; for this is not meet to be done by an Exhortation. It does not help at all to ſay, that *by their rational Abilities they can diſcern the Nature and Tendency of theſe Exhortations*: for (though I ſee not how this can ſtand with much that you have ſaid concerning the darkneſs of the Underſtanding) yet if their Wills are naturally as immoveable by Exhortations as a dead Body, they are not in their nature fit to be wrought upon by them. And this the Doctor does in effect confeſs in the remainder of his Anſwer: *And becauſe theſe Faculties are the principle and ſubject of all actual Obedience, it is granted that there is in Man a natural remote paſſive power to yield obedience unto God, which yet can never put forth it ſelf without the* Almighty *working of Grace.* This is a very liberal *Grant* indeed, for ſo there is in a dead Body a *natural remote paſſive power* to live, *which yet can never put forth it ſelf* till God is pleaſed to raiſe it by his Omnipotence. And if this be all the Doctor *grants* to the unregenerate man, he has yielded to the Objection, *viz.* that it is then as vain to exhort ſuch a man to Convert, as it is to exhort *dead men to live.*

He anſwers 2. That *Exhortations, Promiſes, and Threatnings, reſpect not primarily our preſent ability, but our duty: Their end is, to declare unto us not what we can do, but what we ought to do; and this is done fully in them.*

This Anſwer is inconſiſtent wth the former: For if it be not one end of Exhortations to declare to us what we can do ſome way or other,

as

as you ſay it is not, in this ſecond Anſwer; then our Wills and Affections are not meet to be wrought upon by them, nor are they proper to produce the effects of Obedience, as you ſay they are, in your firſt Anſwer; for an Exhortation to an impoſſible thing, is not proper to produce Obedience.

But letting this paſs, compare this Anſwer with the Objection, and it muſt run in this manner, *viz.* that the Laws, Promiſes and Threatnings, and the Exhortations of the Goſpel, are not *vain* and *ludicrous*, though made to thoſe who have no more power to obey, than the dead have to live; becauſe the onely or principal end of theſe means, is to declare unto men what their *duty* is, and *that* they may learn, however unable they are to perform it.

To this I might anſwer, by queſtioning whether it be poſſible to declare *to them* what their duty is, who are properly dead, as the Doctor means. *Lazarus come forth*, cannot declare to *Lazarus* that he is to come forth, while the words reach a dead ear. But ſetting this Anſwer aſide, I will admit for once, that if the *onely* or the *principal* end of theſe means be to declare what is duty, then the *Exhortations*, &c. are not made *vainly* and *ludicrouſly*, let the Duties preſcribed be never ſo impoſſible to them of whom they are required. But this is neither the *onely*, nor the *principal* end of theſe things, nor is it *at all* the end of ſome of them; and if this can be proved, his Anſwer does not ſatisfie the Objection.

1. It

1. It is not *at all* the end of ſome of them, *viz.* of the *Promiſes* and *Threatnings* of the Law: for the end of theſe things is not to declare to men *what* is their duty, but to *move* and *perſwade* them to the performance of it. Whatſoever is to be done, or not to be done, is *fully declared* in the *Precepts* or *Prohibitions* of the Law; and all that is *declared* in the *Promiſes* and *Threatnings* of the Law, is the Reward we ſhall obtain, or the Puniſhment we ſhall incur if we diſobey. Wherefore it is not *at all* the end of the *Promiſes* and *Threatnings*, (which are ſome of the means towards the Converſion of a ſinner, which the Doctor ſpeaks of) to declare unto us *what* we ought to do.

2. It is not the *onely* end of any of theſe means; for it is not the *onely* end of the Precepts, or Prohibitions, or Exhortations of the Goſpel, in reſpect of which alone this can be pretended. This is not the only end of theſe things, becauſe one end of the Law is *Obedience*; which is plain from hence, that the Precepts, *&c.* of the Law are enforced with Promiſes and Threatnings, the onely end whereof, is to conſtrain to Obedience by the motives of Hope and Fear. But *Obedience* is one thing, and *Knowledge* another; therefore Knowledge is not the onely end of the *Precepts* of the Goſpel, therefore their *onely* end is not to declare to us what we ought to do.

3. Neither is the knowledge of Duty the *principal* end of the Law: For, *The end of the commandment is charity, out of a pure heart, and of*

a

a good conſcience, and of faith unfeigned, 1 Tim. 1.5. Now that which is emphatically ſaid to be *the end* of any thing, is either the onely or the principal end thereof. *Knowledge* cannot be the principal end of the Law, becauſe 'tis in order to a farther end, *viz. ſincere Obedience*. Hence St. *Paul* exhorted believers to *walk ſo as to pleaſe God*, and *to abound more and more*, becauſe they *knew what Commandments he had given them by the Lord Jeſus*, 1 Theſſ. 4. 1, 2. Farther, that is the principal end of the Law, to the attainment whereof the *reward* is promiſed: Therefore not the knowledge, but the performance of Duty is that end. *Not every one that ſaith unto me, Lord, Lord, ſhall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that DOETH THE WILL of my Father which is in heaven. Therefore whoever heareth theſe ſayings of mine, and DOETH THEM, I will liken him*, &c. *Matth.* 7. 21. *&c.* Again, *If ye know theſe things, happy are ye if ye DO THEM*, Joh. 13. 17. So likewiſe St. *Paul*; *Not the hearers of the law are juſt before God, but the DOERS OF THE LAW, ſhall be juſtified*, Rom. 2. 13. And St. *James*, *He that is not a forgetful hearer, but a DOER OF THE WORK, ſhall be BLESSED IN HIS DEED*, James 1. 25. Finally, that is the *principal* end of the Law, and of Exhortations grounded thereupon, without which all other ends of the Law being attained, do *not profit*, but rather *hurt*; therefore Obedience and not Knowledge is the *principal* end. *He that knoweth his maſters will and DOETH IT NOT, ſhall be beaten with MANY ſtripes*, Luke 12. 47. *If I had not come and SPOKEN to them, they had not had ſin; but now they have NO CLOAK for their ſin*, Joh. 15. 22.

From

From all which it is most evident, that the principal designe of the Evangelical Laws and Exhortations is not answered by Knowledge; and that it cannot be truely said, that the *primary* or chief end of these things, is to *declare unto us what we ought to do.*

But seeing *Obedience* is the end of the Law, it is alike evident, that those *Commands* which are impossible to be performed, even as impossible as for the *dead* to raise themselves, are *vain* and *ludicrous*; and they are yet more so, if they are urged with *Promises* and *Threatnings*; for where the condition is impossible, it is as vain to *hope*, or to *fear*, as to think of doing it. But most of all are those *Exhortations ludicrous*, which are grounded upon the Law, if the matter of it be utterly impossible: for *Exhortations* carry the appearance of a serious and charitable intention, and some hope of prevailing; but nothing of this can be implied in any mans exhorting another to that which he knows is not possible to be done by him; and therefore his exhortation is nothing better than *Hypocrisie*, and *Mockery.*

It is then plain, that the Laws and Exhortations of the Gospel, *do declare unto us* not onely *what we ought to do*, but also *what we can do.* I do not say, that *these* or *either* of these is *the end* of the Law Evangelical, (which is the Doctors expression) for *the end* of the Law is Obedience; and in order to this end, it *declares to us* what we *may*, as well as what we *ought* to do; otherwise it would destroy its own end, and thereby be made *vain* and *ludicrous.* But

But ſays the Doctor, this *is the Pelagianiſm anathematized by ſo many Councils of old.* It is not done like ſuch a *beaten Divine*, as I ſuppoſe his friend Mr. *H.* takes him to be, to bring in an Objection againſt his Adverſaries opinion, which does not help in the leaſt to clear his own from that Objection he had undertaken to anſwer. *Well*, but *what is the Pelagianiſm anathematized of old?* The *Pelagianiſm* is, that *what God commands or exhorts us unto, with Promiſes and Threatnings, we have power IN AND OF OUR SELVES to do.* This indeed is *Pelagianiſm*; but it is not *Pelagianiſm* to ſay, That by the *preventing* Grace of God we are enabled to begin well, and by his *co-operating* Grace to proceed, and that by degrees, through his *Grace* ſtill, we may be able to perfect holineſs in the fear of God. He that holds this Doctrine, rejects the former; ſo that we do *not* onely *profeſs* that we reject it, but the principles we teach are wholly inconſiſtent with it; and moreover, we hold nothing which does by any good conſequence infer it. This one would think ſhould ſtop the mouth of Slander; however it is enough to convince all, but men of a groſs Apprehenſion and an invincible prejudice, that our Profeſſion is ſincere.

We pretend not that the Laws and Exhortations of the Goſpel ſuppoſe that of *our ſelves* we have ability to obey; we onely ſay that they ſuppoſe *an ability in us* ſo to do. And it is all one towards the vindicating of the ſeriouſneſs of God in commanding and exhorting us under the higheſt penalties, whether this Ability be from *Nature*, or from *Grace*. But we, with the Scri-

ptures, do ſay it is from *Grace*; and do we therefore deſerve to be thought *Pelagian Hereticks?*

So little ground there is for the inſinuation of this Calumny, that in this very place the Doctor himſelf hath ſaid, that which in effect does clear us from it: For thus he cloſes his ſecond Anſwer; *In the Church it hath hitherto been believed,* (as if it were not believed now) *that the Command directs our duty, but the Promiſe gives ſtrength for the Performance.* Now this, by the connexion of his words, is ſuppoſed to be the *Antipelagian* Doctrine; though it is no more than what *Pelagius* himſelf ſaid, unleſs by the *Promiſe Giving ſtrength*, you mean, that the Promiſe doth aſſure us that *God* will give ſtrength; and therefore in this ſence I ſhall underſtand him.

Now, 1. *This* we *believe* and profeſs *with the Church*, and therefore are not *Pelagians* in this matter. If your own Conſcience does not accuſe you of miſreporting us, it is yet ſomething, that we can convict you of it from your own words. But to come to the Argument; 2. If that which peculiarly belongs to the *Promiſe*, be to *give ſtrength for the performance* of what is commanded, then you your ſelf have deſtroyed your ſecond Anſwer to the Objection, *viz. That the Promiſes reſpect not primarily our preſent ability*, and that *their end is not to declare unto us what we can do.* When you have reconciled theſe things, I deſire you to go on and conſider, 3. That if the Promiſe *gives ſtrength*, as certainly and univerſally as the Command *directs*, then the Promiſe gives ſtrength to us *all*; the reaſon is, becauſe we

we are *all* directed by the Command. Therefore the performance of what is commanded is poſſible to *all*; and therefore you have yielded up your darling opinion to the force of that Objection which we make againſt it. You have yielded it up, I mean, if you will ſtand to this *laſt* paſſage of your Anſwer: I believe indeed you had rather ſtick to the *firſt*, when you ſee how eaſie it is to ſhew you that *both* of them cannot be true. But will not any indifferent men ſay, that you had rather venture the ſhame of contradicting your ſelf within the compaſs of ten lines, than miſs the leaſt opportunity of calling us *Pelagians?* A mans keenneſs upon his Adverſary, makes him reaſon worſe than otherwiſe he would have done: and it often happens, that he will venture to ſpoil an Argument, for the ſake of giving a bad Name.

To the Objection he anſwers 3. That *God is pleaſed to make theſe Exhortations and Promiſes to be* Vehicula Gratiæ, *the means of communicating ſpiritual Life and Strength unto men: And he hath appointed them unto this end, becauſe, conſidering the moral and intellectual Faculties of the Mindes of men, they are ſuited thereunto. God may therefore wiſely make uſe of them, and command them to be uſed towards men, notwithſtanding all their own diſability ſavingly to comply with them, ſeeing he can, will, and doth himſelf make them effectual unto the end aimed at.*

To this I reply, that he ſuppoſes God is pleaſed to make them means of communicating ſpiritual Life to *all*, or to *ſome* onely. The former ſeems to be implied in the words of his Anſwer,

becauſe the reaſon way God is ſaid to uſe them for this end, is common to *all*, viz. becauſe they are *ſuited to the moral and Intellectual Faculties of the Mindes of men:* And, becauſe he ſays therefore God may *wiſely command them to be uſed towards men:* but God has commanded them to be uſed towards *all* men; and this, notwithſtanding *their diſability to comply with them ſavingly*; which he ſuppoſeth to be the caſe of *all*. Again, if he intends that they are *Vehicles of Grace*, and *means of life* to *all*, the meaning muſt be, either that they are means of communicating that Grace to them, whereby they *may* obtain the end of them, *viz.* Converſion; and if this be his meaning, then inſtead of anſwering the Objection, he confeſſeth his own Concluſion to be falſe: or his meaning muſt be, that God is pleaſed by the Goſpel to communicate that Grace to *all*, by which they cannot but be converted; but that is not true, becauſe *all* are not converted.

But though his words imply that *All* are meant, yet his Cauſe requires that *ſome* only ſhould be meant, *viz.* thoſe *few* who were perſonally elected. And if this be his meaning, then his Anſwer to the Objection is this: That God may wiſely uſe Exhortations and Promiſes to thoſe who are as incapable of being converted by them, as a dead Body is of being perſwaded to live; becauſe theſe Exhortations are means of Life to *ſome* of them. If this be a ſufficient Anſwer to the Objection, then it ſhews that ſuch Exhortations are wiſely uſed to *thoſe few* whom God will convert by his Almighty Power, and likewiſe to the *reſt*, who are left under their natu-

ural impoſſibility of converting. Now, 1. I ſee ot how this Anſwer *ſhews* that Exhortations re wiſely uſed to *thoſe few* who are to be converted by the irreſiſtible Work; becauſe Exhortations cannot be ſaid properly to be means of doing that which cannot be done but by Omnipotence. If I could raiſe the dead to life, it would not be wiſely done to exhort and perſwade them to live, before I raiſed them; becauſe ſuch perſwaſion can contribute nothing to the end. 2. This Anſwer doth not *pretend to ſhew* that Exhortations may wiſely be uſed towards the *reſt*, who are left always in their Natural ſtate: And the principal ſtreſs of the Objection lies againſt that. Now if it were true that they are properly enough uſed upon thoſe, whom God will at one time or another take the opportunity of converting by his Omnipotence; yet it follows not from thence that they are proper for the reſt: But ſtill it ſeems to be *vain* and *ludicrous* to *deal with* theſe by exhorting and trying to perſwade. The Doctor ſhould have ſhewn it not to be *vain* and *ludicrous* to exhort *theſe*; and he endeavours to ſhew that it is not *vain* to exhort *others*.

And now the Doctor's Anſwer to the Objection propounded may be thus briefly expreſt.

1. That *the Underſtandings, Wills, and Affections of men, are meet to be wrought upon by* Exhortations, *&c. unto their end*, i. e. Converſion; though 'tis as impoſſible to perſwade them to Convert, as it is to perſwade a Dead man to Live.

2. That it is indeed impoſſible to prevail by Exhortations, Promiſes, and Threatnings.

3. That they will prevail, when the Work is already done by an Almighty Power. So much for the firſt Objection.

SECT. 6.

But it will be farther objected, ſaith he, *that if men are thus utterly devoid of a principle of ſpiritual Life, of all Power to live unto God, that is, to repent, believe, and yield obedience; is it righteous that they ſhould periſh eternally merely for their Diſability, or their not doing that which they are not able to do? This would be to require Brick, and to give no Straw, yea, to require much where nothing is given*; and then to puniſh eternally the not doing of what is ſo unreaſonably required. *But the Scripture every where chargeth the deſtruction of men upon their wilful ſin, not their Weakneſs or Diſability.*

P. 245.

This I take to be a very material Objection; or rather, here are two material Objections in theſe words. 1. That it is unjuſt to require under the penalty of eternal death, that which is impoſſible to perform. 2. That the Scripture charges the deſtruction of men to their Wilfulneſs, not to their Weakneſs or Diſability. Now 'tis in vain to anſwer the former, before the latter is anſwered; for if diſobedience, and the conſequent deſtruction, does not proceed from Weakneſs, to what purpoſe is it to ſay whence the

the Weakneſs comes, as he endeavours to ſhew in his firſt Anſwer, *viz.* that it comes from Original ſin?

But we muſt be content to take him in his own way and method: And now let us ſee how he endeavours to remove this Objection (if it be but one) by his Anſwers.

Anſw. 1. *Mens diſability to live to God, is their ſin: Whatever therefore enſues thereupon, may be juſtly charged on them. It is that which came on us by the ſin of our Nature in our firſt Parents; all whoſe conſequents are our ſin and our miſery,* Rom. 5. 12. *Had it befallen us without a guilt truely our own, according to the Law of our Creation, and Covenant of our Obedience, the caſe would have been otherwiſe: But on this ſuppoſition thoſe who periſh, do but feed on the fruit of their own ways.*

[*Mens diſability to live to God is their ſin.*] If by *ſin* he means ſimply, *a tranſgreſſion of the Law*; then, 1. There is ſome Law requiring men *to be able* to live to God before they are converted by the Irreſiſtible act. But if the Doctor can ſhew no ſuch Law, then it does not appear that the *diſability* he ſpeaks of is a *ſin*. 2. Admitting this diſability were a ſin, yet the Anſwer does not ſatisfie the Objection: for the Objection was, That it ſeems unrighteous to puniſh men eternally for any thing that was *utterly unavoidable* by them; and by conſequence, for *thoſe tranſgreſſions of the Law* which were ſo unavoidable. Had the Objection been, That it is unrighteous to condemn men for what is *not ſin*, or no tranſgreſſion of the Law; then it had

been pertinent to say that mens disability to live to God is *their sin*; but then withal he needed not to have gone so far about, as to instance in the sin of *disability* to repent and believe: It had been enough to say, that their *Unbelief and Impenitence* are sins, and therefore God may righteously condemn them to eternal punishment. But this is to wave the Objection, instead of answering it.

But if by saying that their disability is *their sin*, he means that it was an effect of their own choice, or as he expresses himself, that it did not *befal them without a guilt truely their own*; this indeed, if it be true, takes away the Objection, and, as he says, *whatsoever ensues thereon, may be justly charged on them*: for although they are now utterly disabled, yet it is through their own fault; which implies, that once they were able, and therefore they are not condemned for not doing what was always impossible. Now that it was sometime possible for them to *believe and repent*, he thinks is plain from hence, that they had power in their *first Parents* so to do: for this is clearly implied in his pretence, *that our disability to live to God again, came upon us by the sin of our first Parents*; Therefore we have been disabled ever since the Fall; Therefore if ever we had any ability, it must be before the Fall; Therefore if we had any at all, it must be in *Adam*. And this commonly is the last refuge of these men, when they are put to it, how to reconcile the commanding of things impossible under pain of eternal damnation, *viz.* that we had power in *Adam* to do what the Gospel now requires of us.

But

But in the firſt place, this Anſwer ſeems to imply, that the ground of the Objection is ſolid, *viz.* that to require of men what was *ever* impoſſible to them, under the higheſt penalties, is unjuſt and cruel. For were they not conſtrained to acknowledge this, or at leaſt unwilling to deny it, one would wonder why they ſhould run back as far as *Adam*, to finde out a poſſibility for us of repenting and believing.

For to ſay that we had an ability of recovering our ſelves in *Adam* whilſt he was innocent, is a pretence ſo lamentably weak, that nothing but a deſperate Cauſe could force a man to take ſhelter in it. For,

1. *Adam* himſelf whilſt he *ſtood*, had no ability *in caſe he ſhould fall*, to riſe again by Faith and Repentance; therefore we could have no ſuch power in *Adam* to recover our ſelves: For ſurely we could have no more power in *Adam*, than *Adam* had in himſelf. Now, that he had no ſuch power is plain from hence, that if he had it before his Fall, then he had it after his Fall too: for that power which he had before his Fall to recover himſelf from it, could not be loſt by the Fall it ſelf; for if that rendred him unable, then whilſt he ſtood he had not power ſufficent to riſe in caſe of that Fall; which is the thing to be proved. But that *Adam* after the Fall, had not the power to recover himſelf, is plain from hence, that if he had it, then he needed no new ſtrength from God to enable him to riſe; *i. e.* he was then able to repent and believe without the renewing Grace of God. And this

ſeems

ſeems to be one great unhappineſs of the Doctors Principles, that he is forced into *Pelagianiſm*, as well to anſwer our Arguments againſt them, as to maintain his own for them. But if *Adam* after his Fall needed the Grace of God to enable him to recover himſelf by Repentance, Faith, and new Obedience; then after his Fall he had not in himſelf ſufficient power ſo to do; Therefore he had no ſuch power *before* his Fall; Therefore *we* had not that power in him. Therefore this Anſwer of the Doctors doth not ſhew that Repentance and Faith were ever poſſible to all thoſe of whom they are required under pain of eternal damnation.

This is the truth of the caſe in ſhort, That *Adam* in the ſtate of Innocence had power to keep from falling, but not to riſe (without new Grace) after a lapſe: Therefore if it could be ſaid that we had ſome ſpiritual power in *Adam* before his Fall, which we loſt by *it*, this could not be the power of recovering by Repentance: for *Adam* had not that before the Fall, but rather it ſhould be the power of never tranſgreſſing the Law of God, and of needing no Repentance; for that power *Adam* had. But,

2. It is indeed abſurd to ſay, that *we had power in* Adam either to obey without ſin, or to repent after ſin, which we loſt by his Fall. For whilſt we were in his Loins, we were not capable of having any power at all: And if it be ſaid that we loſt that power which now we want, but might not have wanted if he had kept his ſtation; it muſt be ſaid too, that we loſt it before we had it. Nay, ſay they, but our *Na-*

ture

ture had it in *Adam*. 'Tis very true, but *we* had it never the more for that; for our *Nature* is one thing, and our *Persons* another; for our Nature was in being when our Persons were not. And the Question is not concerning the Justice of condemning *Nature*, but of condemning persons to eternal punishments, for not doing what was always impossible for them to do. It is true enough, that our *first Parents* once had it in *their* power to leave their Posterity under a possibility of being *without sin*; but it follows not, therefore *we* had it in *ours*. Nay, the contrary is most evident, since we could neither hinder the *sin of our Nature in our first Parents*, nor that influence which it had upon us to make us sinners. Wherefore, if it could be said, that they in their Innocence had likewise a power to *repent*, which they lost by their first sin; yet, that therefore we had that power too, has not the least appearance of a good consequence.

But farther, admitting that we had such power in our first Parents, and that we lost it by the *sin of our Nature* in them; yet since the second or the Evangelical Law was given *after* the Fall, and that established upon more severe penalties than the original Law given to *Adam*; it must be granted, that the fulfilling of the Evangelical Law was, according to the Doctors principles, impossible *at that very time*, or rather *before* it was given. The Law of Repentance and Faith, was not in force till our first Parents had sinned; but upon the Doctor's *Hypothesis*, it was impossible to be fulfilled *before* it was in force. And what Justice can there be in requiring obedience to such a Law, upon pain of more grievous punishments

niſhments than we were liable to before? To ſuch a Law, I ſay, as we had power to fulfil when we *did not* need it, but had loſt all power to fulfil it when we *did*.

If you ſay that our diſability to obey this Law is the puniſhment of a former fault, *viz.* of *the ſin of our Nature in our firſt Parents*, I grant it; yet it is not juſt that we ſhould be tied to obey that Law, under the threatning of another puniſhment much more ſevere, and that no leſs than eternal; unleſs our diſability be ſupplied by new Grace, as we ſay it is.

If a mans whole Eſtate were confiſcated for his Fathers Treaſon, would it be juſt to require of him upon pain of death, ſuch preſent Contributions to the Crown, as the puniſhment of his Fathers fault makes it impoſſible for him to pay? Or if a ſeditious Talker were puniſht with the loſs of his Tongue, would you think it were juſt to make a Law to hang him afterward, unleſs he would make an *audible* Recantation? Do not faſten that Injuſtice upon the moſt holy God, which you would abhor in a ſinful man.

But farther yet: It is ſtill more unjuſt to preſcribe impoſſibilities as a condition of Pardon; but to the obedience of the Evangelical Law, forgiveneſs of all paſt offences is promiſed. And what juſtice could there be in preſcribing that Law with ſuch a Promiſe, if the Law was impoſſible to be performed from the firſt moment it was delivered? For deceitful and inſincere dealing is unrighteous. Now he that offers pardon upon ſome condition, does plainly pretend, that

that (so far as the Pardon is offered) he will not impute the *first* fault, but deal with the Offender according to his *future* carriage. But if he requires what, he knows, the *first* fault has rendred utterly impossible to be done by him, he still imputes that fault; and instead of putting the Offender into a way of being forgiven, he makes it impossible for him to be forgiven; which is nothing else but to punish him at the same time when he pretends to remit the punishment. But now, if this impossible condition of Forgiveness is required also under a greater penalty than was threatned to the first offence, then the first offence is so far from being made *pardonable* by the Condition, that it is thereby *more grievously* punished. So that there is not onely no mercy shewn in the promise of Pardon upon such terms, and in these circumstances; but on the contrary, an exteam, not to say an unjust, severity. It is better for a Malefactor to have a speedy Execution, than to have some respite for the performance of an impossible Condition of Pardon, and afterward to pay for his Reprieve with exquisite Torments, and a lingring Death.

To apply this: It is plain, and *these men* cannot deny it, that the remission of all past offences, and therefore of *Original sin*, is promised to the obedience of the *Evangelical Law*. But if by reason of Original sin, the performance of this Condition was impossible from the very first moment that it was required; then the promise of Forgiveness was *deceitfully* and *unrighteously* made, especially since a more grievous penalty is incurr'd by failing of the performance. We grant,

niſhments than we were liable to before? To ſuch a Law, I ſay, as we had power to fulfil when we *did not* need it, but had loſt all power to fulfil it when we *did*.

If you ſay that our diſability to obey this Law is the puniſhment of a former fault, *viz.* of *the ſin of our Nature in our firſt Parents*, I grant it; yet it is not juſt that we ſhould be tied to obey that Law, under the threatning of another puniſhment much more ſevere, and that no leſs than eternal; unleſs our diſability be ſupplied by new Grace, as we ſay it is.

If a mans whole Eſtate were confiſcated for his Fathers Treaſon, would it be juſt to require of him upon pain of death, ſuch preſent Contributions to the Crown, as the puniſhment of his Fathers fault makes it impoſſible for him to pay? Or if a ſeditious Talker were puniſht with the loſs of his Tongue, would you think it were juſt to make a Law to hang him afterward, unleſs he would make an *audible* Recantation? Do not faſten that Injuſtice upon the moſt holy God, which you would abhor in a ſinful man.

But farther yet: It is ſtill more unjuſt to preſcribe impoſſibilities as a condition of Pardon; but to the obedience of the Evangelical Law, forgiveneſs of all paſt offences is promiſed. And what juſtice could there be in preſcribing that Law with ſuch a Promiſe, if the Law was impoſſible to be performed from the firſt moment it was delivered? For deceitful and inſincere dealing is unrighteous. Now he that offers pardon upon ſome condition, does plainly pretend, that

that (ſo far as the Pardon is offered) he will not impute the *firſt* fault, but deal with the Offender according to his *future* carriage. But if he requires what, he knows, the *firſt* fault has rendred utterly impoſſible to be done by him, he ſtill imputes that fault; and inſtead of putting the Offender into a way of being forgiven, he makes it impoſſible for him to be forgiven; which is nothing elſe but to puniſh him at the ſame time when he pretends to remit the puniſhment. But now, if this impoſſible condition of Forgiveneſs is required alſo under a greater penalty than was threatned to the firſt offence, then the firſt offence is ſo far from being made *pardonable* by the Condition, that it is thereby *more grievouſly* puniſhed. So that there is not onely no mercy ſhewn in the promiſe of Pardon upon ſuch terms, and in theſe circumſtances; but on the contrary, an exteam, not to ſay an unjuſt, ſeverity. It is better for a Malefactor to have a ſpeedy Execution, than to have ſome reſpite for the performance of an impoſſible Condition of Pardon, and afterward to pay for his Reprieve with exquiſite Torments, and a lingring Death.

To apply this: It is plain, and *theſe men* cannot deny it, that the remiſſion of all paſt offences, and therefore of *Original ſin*, is promiſed to the obedience of the *Evangelical Law*. But if by reaſon of Original ſin, the performance of this Condition was impoſſible from the very firſt moment that it was required; then the promiſe of Forgiveneſs was *deceitfully* and *unrighteouſly* made, eſpecially ſince a more grievous penalty is incurr'd by failing of the performance. We grant,

grant, that by reaſon of Original ſin, we are utterly diſabled for the performance, without new Grace from God; but *we* ſay he gives ſuch Grace to all of us, by which it is truely poſſible for us to perform the Condition, (and upon this ground he may and doth moſt righteouſly require it:) but *theſe men* deny it; and if they can reconcile their opinion with the Divine Juſtice, they muſt either ſhew that inſincerity is not Unrighteouſneſs, or that this way of dealing is not inſincere; and let them ſhew it when they can.

Nay, it would be yet more unjuſt, if the Condition were utterly impoſſible, becauſe 'tis pretended in the Scripture, that the loſs we have ſuſtained by our firſt Parents, is upon the whole matter more than recompenſed by the Grace of the ſecond Covenant. But this could not be ſincerely pretended, if their ſin hath rendred Obedience impoſſible without that Grace which is given but to a few of thoſe of whom it is required. Now it is apparent not onely from the whole tenour of the Goſpel, but in particular from *Rom.* 5. 15, 16, 17, *&c.* (which place the Doctor very boldly cites for his opinion) that the Grace of God by Jeſus Chriſt, is greater than the miſchief we have received by *Adam*'s Tranſgreſſion; at leaſt that the Goſpel has provided a remedy for us againſt the evil conſequences of Original ſin. If the Doctor ſhould deny this, there is another Authority which I hope he will not contradict, and that is his own. For he tells us in another place, that *Natural men have a way of eſcape and deliverance, provided for them, and propounded to them.* This is a good ſaying and

P. 228.

a

true; for this is that which is clearly pretended in the Covenant of Grace: But thoſe Natural men have no *way of eſcape*, who are utterly diſabled by the ſin of their firſt Parents from uſing it, and have no remedy provided againſt their diſability. And he tells us, that the *Darkneſs of Natural men is no leſs effectual to binde them in a ſtate of ſin, without the powerful*, i. e. irreſiſtible *Illumination of the Holy Ghoſt, than it is in the Devils themſelves.* Wherefore, according to him, the greateſt number of thoſe for whom the remedy was provided, are as unable to get out of the ſtate of ſin by it, as the Devils themſelves for whom it was never provided.

But do you believe that the Goſpel is a remedy againſt the miſchief of Original ſin, and a way to eſcape out of that ſtate into which we were fallen by the *ſin* of our *firſt Parents? Anſ.* Yes. And ſhall they to whom this way is propounded, be damned more ſeverely for their unbelief and impenitence, if they uſe it not, but live and die in their ſins? *Anſ.* Yes. Was it then in their power to have uſed the remedy, by believing and obeying the Goſpel? *Anſ.* No, it was not, any more than in the *power of the Devils themſelves.* But is it righteous in God to Condemn them for not doing what was always impoſſible to be done by them? *Anſ.* It is righteous, becauſe *their diſability came upon them by the ſin of their firſt Parents.* But did you not ſay at firſt, that God had provided a remedy for them againſt the ſin of their firſt Parents, and the hurt they received by it?

If the Doctor ſtands to his Principles, I will leave

leave any man to judge whether he can come off any other way, than by saying, It is true, such a remedy was provided and propounded, but it was never intended that they should be the better for it. And what is this, but to charge insincerity and falsehood upon the God of Faithfulness and Truth!

If a Physitian should come to a sick man, extreamly wasted in body, and decayed in strength, and should profess a serious and earnest desire to set him upon his legs again, and withal, give him good assurance of recovery, in case the Patient will follow his directions, which he vehemently promises to do; it would certainly be expected, that he should prescribe such rules to him as it was possible for one in his circumstances to follow. But if he should then require the sick man to feed heartily upon the strongest Meats, and to walk about the Fields some hours together; assuring him, that if he follows this advice, he shall soon feel himself an healthy man: would not the Patient tell him, that this was that which he was utterly disabled from doing, by the sickness that is upon him? But if the Physician should grow angry, and reply, *But you were able to do this when you were in health*; and should thereupon desert his Patient, for not using *that way to escape which he propounded to him*, would not any man say, that he was detestably foolish and unjust for so doing?

Now to say the truth, it is no better, but rather a much worse representation of God Almighty, which *these men* offer to us. Our Blessed Saviour is the Physician whom God hath sent

sent to heal our Natures of that hurt which we got by the Fall: He hath prescribed us a Remedy, promising Life to us if we use it; but, if we use it not, threatning not only *to desert* us, but to punish us with everlasting Pains. But now, although (as the Doctor himself grants) *we may have real designes, desires and endeavours, after that which is presented to us as our chiefest Good*, yet it may be as impossible for us to obtain it, as for the *Devils themselves*. But how then is God righteous in our Condemnation? Because we had once power *of living to God*, as our Saviour requires us now to do. When had we that power? Forsooth we had it in *Adam*. But do you not then make that disability a reason of the righteousness of our Condemnation, against which our Physician promised to relieve us? Is not this the blasphemy of charging God with Hypocrisie, in propounding to men an useless Remedy, while you would vindicate his Justice in punishing them for not being able to use it? Whether Hypocrites and Tyrants can like it well, that God should thus deal with Men, I know not; but to use the words of an excellent man, *Certainly I, for my part, fear I should not love God, if I should think so strangely of him.* P. 250.

By what hath been said, the understanding Reader may observe, that this Answer taken from the Transgression of our first Parents, is so far from clearing the Justice of God, on supposition of the Doctrine against which the Objection is made; that on the other hand it throws more foul reproaches on the Divine Majesty, which is ever to be loved and adored, than the Doctrine it self doth.

I have been the longer in conſidering this Anſwer, becauſe theſe men do uſually reſerve it for the *laſt hole* to earth themſelves in, when they can make no other ſhift to avoid the Argument. The Doctor indeed is pleaſed to uſe it for the *Firſt*, and ſo the greateſt trouble is over. I ſhall examine his other Anſwers more briefly.

Anſw. 2. *In the Tranſactions between God and the Souls of men, with reſpect unto their Obedience and Salvation, there is none of them but hath a Power in ſundry things, as to ſome degrees and meaſures of them, to comply with his Minde and Will, which they voluntarily neglect. And this of it ſelf is ſufficient to bear the charge of their eternal ruine.*

The Doctor ſhould have told us, what *Tranſactions* he means *between God and the Souls of men*; and what *things* men *have a power in*, and what are the *Degrees and Meaſures* of thoſe things: But ſince he has not, I muſt gueſs at his meaning as well as I can. In general it is this, that one may be righteouſly condemned for not doing what was in his power. But the Objection was, that God cannot righteouſly condemn a man for not doing what was *always impoſſible* to be done by him: And doth the Doctor think this Objection is Anſwered, by ſaying, that he may righteouſly condemn him for neglecting what was *poſſible* to be done? More particularly, by thoſe things which *are in a mans power*, I think he means that *moral life which*, he ſaies elſewhere, P. 216. *the Natural man may magnifie and extol*, and ſome *external Duties*, together with *real deſignes and endeavours after that which is preſented as the chiefeſt good.*

good. Now the Doctor has granted not only that the Natural man *may*, but that he *doth* ſometimes comply with the Will of God in thoſe things; *viz.* that he *chuſeth a Moral life*, that he *performs the external Duties* of Religion, that he *has real deſignes and endeavours after Salvation.* But now all this is not, according to him, *believing*, and *repenting*, and *living to God.* I ask then, What will become of this Natural Man at laſt, if he goes no farther? The Doctor anſwers, That his *Moral Life will ſtand him in no more ſtead than the Life of ſin and pleaſure, which he hath forſaken*; and his *deſires to be ſaved, are no ſaving Diſpoſitions to Life*; and for all his *external performances, periſh he muſt, and that eternally.* But I ask farther, what muſt then *bear the charge of his eternal ruine?* For he hath quitted the Life of ſin and pleaſure, and he deſires Salvation, *&c.* And you muſt not be ſo unreaſonable, as to expect he ſhould repent and believe, and live to God, without being converted by Almighty Grace. So that as far as I can ſee, the Doctor's ſecond Anſwer comes to no more than this, that a Natural man may be righteouſly damn'd, for not doing that, which though he has done, yet he ſhall be damn'd for all that, becauſe he did not ſomething alſo which was utterly impoſſible for him to Do. This is his Second Anſwer. P. 251.

Anſw. 3. *No man is ſo unable to live unto God, to do any thing for him, but that withal he is able to do any thing againſt him.*

That the Unregenerate Man is able to live in ſin, while he doth live in it, will be a moſt certain truth, as long as *Ab actu ad potentiam valet conſe-*

conſequentia, holds good. But if it be utterly impoſſible for him to live to God, it is yet more certain, that he is able not to do ſo. This I confeſs is very plain. But what is this to the Objection? Doth the Doctor think, that a man may juſtly be puniſht for being *Able* to do evil? And what elſe ſhould he mean, when he aſſignes the Natural Mans Ability *to do any thing againſt God*, in Anſwer to this Objection, that it ſeems not righteous to condemn him for his utter *Inability to do any thing for him?* If that be the Doctors meaning, then a man may be righteouſly condemned, according to him, for being *able to do evil*, though he *does it not*. For if ability to do evil be a ſufficient reaſon for their condemnation, who never had any ability to do otherwiſe, I would know of the Doctor, why it is not ſufficient for the condemnation of *all* that are able to do evil. But ſurely it is praiſe-worthy not to do evil, when one is able to do it: Therefore to be able to do evil, is no ſufficient reaſon for any mans condemnation; Therefore not for theirs, who are utterly unable to do any good.

It is ſomething more colourable, which he ſaies in the cloſe of this Anſwer, *viz.* that, *As they cannot come to Chriſt, unleſs the Father draws them* by an Irreſiſtible Force, *ſo they WILL NOT come, that they might have life; wherefore their Deſtruction is juſt, and of themſelves.*

Thoſe words of our Saviour, *Ye will not come unto me that ye might have Life*, imply, that it was then poſſible, or at leaſt had been poſſible, for them to come who actually refuſed. If this be not implied, then, as the Objection pretends, their Con-

Condemnation could not be juſt. Yes, ſaith the Doctor, it was juſt, becauſe they *would not* come. This indeed were ſomething, if, *Firſt*, it was then, or at leaſt once had been poſſible for them to be *Willing*: and *Secondly*, if ſuppoſing their Will to have been good, it had been poſſible for them to *come*, without being irreſiſtibly made to come. For if it were impoſſible to be *willing*, how ſhould they come; if it were impoſſible to *Come*, to what end ſhould they be willing? But according to the Doctor's Principles, neither of theſe things was poſſible: and therefore if his Principles be true, the Condemnation of theſe men could *not be juſt*, as *being not of themſelves*. And this is a plain Argument that they are not true.

Theſe are all his Anſwers to the Objection; and I am very ſenſible that they deſerved not ſuch ſolemn Replies as I have endeavoured to confute them withal. But his frequent repetitions of theſe Anſwers to the ſame Objection in other places of his Book, and that exceſſive confidence in their ſtrength, which he betrays upon all occaſions of ſcorning the Objection, and them that make it; This, I ſay, made me think it neceſſary to ſhew plainly and diſtinctly what little reaſon he has to lay ſo great a ſtreſs upon them; otherwiſe I ſhould have been aſhamed to beſtow all this pains about them.

He propounds two other Objections againſt his Doctrine, and anſwers them at the ſame rate. I know not to what purpoſe I ſhould trouble the Reader with examining what he hath ſaid to them; unleſs my deſigne were to expoſe the Author, inſtead of confuting his Errours. To thoſe

Objections that he has added, twenty more might be added ſtill. But the two former, which as I have ſhewn you, he has not cleared his Cauſe from, are of weight enough to oppreſs it, without the addition of any more.

And ſo much for that Argument from the Metaphor of *Death*, by which he pretends to prove, that an Irreſiſtible Power is equally neceſſary for the converting of a Sinner, and the raiſing of the *Dead*. And theſe are all his Arguments from the conſideration of man's Spiritual ſtate, before Regeneration.

CHAP.

CHAP. IV.

The Work of the H. Spirit in Regeneration conſidered, with reference to the Glory of God, and to the Event of his Grace.

SECT. I.

SOmetimes the Doctor argues in favour of his own Opinion concerning the *manner* of the Holy Spirit's Operation in regenerating us, by pretending to ſhew the dangerous Conſequences of his Adverſaries Doctrine in this point. And this is the ſecond head of Arguments which I propounded to conſider; for though he mingles them with Arguments of another ſort, yet I think they ought to be diſtinctly and ſeparately treated.

This way of arguing for an Opinion, from the ill Conſequences of the contrary, I acknowledge to be very reaſonable; and when it is managed with ſtrength and clearneſs, it will at leaſt reduce an Adverſary to moderation, if it will not quite ſatisfie him. The Conſequences of an Opinion may be ſo bad, that this may be a good reaſon to reject it, without farther conſideration: But when they are not as bad as can be, they may reaſonably put a man upon examining his grounds over again. Since the Doctor has uſed this kinde

of arguing, I suppose he may be of the same minde; and therefore unless he can bring off his own Opinion from those dangerous Consequences which he acknowledges to have been charged upon them, and from which, as I have endeavoured to shew, he has not yet cleared them; this should at least make him more modest in his assertions, and more gentle to his Adversaries than he has shewn himself hitherto in his Writings.

To come towards the Argument: there are two Consequences which the Doctor charges upon his Adversaries Opinion, *viz.* *That the whole glory of our Regeneration is to be ascribed unto our selves, and not to the Grace of God*: and, *That it was absolutely uncertain whether ever any one in the world should be converted unto God or no.*

I begin with the former of these Propositions; which if it be consequent upon the Opinion of his Adversaries, he has no inconsiderable advantage against them. But whether it be or not, is now to be examined.

For which end, it is fit that their Opinion should be first understood, which what it is, hath, I think, been truely declared, though to much disadvantage, in the last Chapter of the First Part. But because the Doctor in stating their Opinion, and comparing it with his own, has given me an occasion here, to speak a little more fully to it, and to note some things by the way, which may help us to understand one another better; I shall briefly shew what he supposes our Judgement to be in this matter.

He

He enters upon the buſineſs with this Preface, p. 256.
That *it is to no purpoſe to endeavour the reducing of the extravagant confuſed diſcourſes of ſome preſent Writers, into a certain and determinate ſtating of the things in difference amongſt us.* This is one of his uſual complements: but he endeavoured to reduce theſe *extravagant diſcourſes*, though he knew it would be *to no purpoſe*.

That, ſays he, *which they ſeem to aim at and conclude, may be reduced to theſe Heads.* 1. *That God adminiſters Grace to all, in the declaration of the Doctrine of the Law and Goſpel.* 2. *That the reception of this Doctrine, the belief and practice of it, is enforced with promiſes and threatnings.* 3. *That the things revealed, taught, and commanded, are not onely good in themſelves, but ſo ſuited unto the Reaſon and Intereſt of Mankinde, as that the Minde cannot but be diſpoſed to receive and obey them, unleſs overpowred by prejudices, and a courſe of ſin.* 4. *That the conſideration of the Promiſes and Threatnings of the Goſpel, is ſufficient to remove theſe prejudices, and reform that courſe.* 5. *That upon a compliance with the Doctrine of the Goſpel, and obedience thereunto, men are made partakers of the Spirit, with other priviledges of the New Teſtament, and have a right unto all the promiſes of the preſent and a future Life.*

Of this he ſaith, 1. That *it is a perfect Syſteme of Pelagianiſm.* Now of a man that talks with ſo much ſcorn of the *extravagant confuſed Writings* of his Adverſaries, one would have expected more accuracy and clearneſs. For nothing is to be call'd *Pelagianiſm*, but the Errours

of

of *Pelagius*; but in this *Systeme*, there are some manifest Truths, for instance, the first Proposition is evidently true: That *God administers Grace unto all in the declaration of the Doctrine of the Law and Gospel*; that is, unto *all* to whom it is declared. For the external declaration of the Gospel is Grace, though not *all* the Grace of God in order to Conversion and Salvation. Besides, every one of those Propositions is true, if candidly interpreted. Those Truths that *Pelagius* owned, did not become *Pelagianism* by his owning them. He addes, 2. That this is a perfect Systeme of Pelagianism, *absolutely exclusive of the Grace of our Lord Jesus Christ*. To which I say, 1. That he who acknowledges all this with *Pelagius*, may very consistently acknowledge with the Catholick Church, all that *Pelagius* denied against the Church in the point of Grace: So that instead of a *perfect Systeme* of *Pelagianism*, he has given us none at all. But 2. since he is pleased to suppose this Systeme to be *absolutely exclusive of the Grace of our Lord Jesus Christ*; and by consequence those men whom he here represents, to deny that Grace absolutely; it is plain, that either he makes the Revelation of the Gospel to be no part of the Grace of *Christ*, or else that by Grace he means the *Internal Operations* of the Spirit onely; for he allows them to believe the Grace of External Revelation, by the first Proposition. And then by the *Consideration of the Promises and Threatnings of the Gospel*, mentioned in the fourth Proposition, he means such Consideration as is not excited or helped by the Internal Operations of the Spirit; for if he means such consideration as is thereby effected, then the *Systeme* does not *absolutely exclude all the* Internal *Grace of our Lord Jesus Christ*. Now

Now we are to obſerve, that he had undertaken, *to enquire into the Nature and Manner of the working of the Spirit of God, in and on the Souls of men in their Regeneration: And this*, he ſaid, *was to be declared both Negatively and Poſitively.* 1. Negatively, *viz.* that it *doth not conſiſt in Moral Suaſion only*; and then he ſhews what his Adverſaries mean by the Moral Suaſion of the Spirit, in that *perfect Syſteme* of *Pelagianiſm* you had before, which is abſolutely excluſive of the Grace of our Lord *Jeſus Chriſt*. That is to ſay, he was reſolved, firſt to declare, and then to confute *their* Opinion concerning the *manner* of the Holy Spirits Operation in and upon the Souls of men in their Regeneration, *who* abſolutely deny that there is any *ſuch Operation* upon their Souls at all. By which it appears how fit a Cenſurer the Doctor is of *extravagant* and *confuſed* Diſcourſes.

If our Opinion concerning the internal Suaſion of the Spirit was this, that there is no ſuch thing; there might be a little more colour for charging our Doctrine concerning Grace, with aſcribing the praiſe of Converſion to our ſelves.

Whether the Doctor repreſented us in this manner, through incogitance or malice, I leave to him: But when he comes to diſpute againſt the ſufficiency of the Spirits *internally perſwading*, he falls as ſeverely upon us for ſuppoſing that kinde of Aid to be ſufficient, as here he dilingenuouſly inſinuates, that we do not ſo much as ſuppoſe it Neceſſary.

'Tis yielded then at laſt, that we acknowledge the internal Operations of the Spirit, and that we

we ſuppoſe the Manner of theſe Operations to be *Moral*, *i. e.* by Arguments fit to perſwade; ſuch as are the Truths of Natural Religion, and the Precepts, Promiſes, and Threatnings of the Goſpel; which are very well put together by the

P. 257. Doctor in diſcourſing upon this point. The power of theſe Arguments to perſwade, is in part likewiſe, exceedingly well deſcribed by him, as conſiſting, in the *Evidence of their Truth*, and in the *Good which they propound on the one hand*, and the *Evil* which they warn us of, on the other. But this is not *all* the Force of the Arguments of Religion; and if this were all, they were not ſufficient to perſwade. For, as an Aſſent to mere Truth doth not move the Will and Affections, unleſs it be of *concernment* to us, propounding *Good* to be obtained, and *Evil* to be avoided; ſo neither is this ſufficient to excite our endeavours after the one, or againſt the other, if the former be not promiſed and the latter threatned *conditionally*. Nor would this move us to endeavour, if the Conditions were not believed to be poſſible. All which is plain to common ſenſe: But there was good reaſon, why the Doctor was not to adde theſe two laſt Conſiderations, when he was ſhewing wherein the force of Divine Truths, to perſwade men to convert, conſiſted; becauſe if he had done ſo, he had plainly overthrown the great deſigne of his Book, which makes the Salvation of the *Elect* to depend upon an Abſolute Decree, and the Conditions of Eternal Life, utterly impoſſible to be performed by the reſt.

P. 258. That *there is a powerful perſwaſive Efficacy in the Motives of Gods Word, to prevail with a man to endeavour his own Converſion*, the Doctor grants.

We

We likewiſe acknowledge, that to make theſe Motives effectual, it is neceſſary that they ſhould be *acted by the Spirit*, as he phraſes it. Again, if he ſuppoſes the Holy Spirit's *acting theſe Motives towards us*, to be ſufficient for the end, as he ſeems to do; it ſhould ſeem we were agreed concerning the manner of the Holy Spirits Operation in Regenerating us; *viz.* that it is in the way of *Inſtruction* and *Perſwaſion*: For what it is to *Act a Motive towards a man*, but to make him underſtand it better, and to perſwade him more earneſtly by it, I cannot conceive. But the Doctor doth not think in earneſt, that *Acting of Motives* is enough: For at length he tells us,

That, *the whole of the Work of the Holy Ghoſt in our Converſion, doth not conſiſt in this moral Operation; but there is a real Phyſical Work, whereby he infuſeth a Gracious Principle of Spiritual Life, into All that are effectually Converted.* And elſewhere, that *notwithſtanding* the utmoſt Inſtructions and Perſwaſions of the Spirit, yet *the Minde of man in the ſtate of Nature, without a ſupernatural Elevation by Grace, is not able to apprehend Divine Truths ſavingly.* Now the immediate Effect of the *Phyſical* work, by this laſt paſſage, ſeems to be a ſupernatural Elevation of the Minde, in order to Saving Faith: But in the former paſſage it is ſaving Faith, or Converſion it ſelf, which by the *Phyſical* work is *infuſed* into the Soul: And if this be his meaning, there is no need of a ſupernatural Elevation of the Minde, before believing; becauſe Faith and Holineſs are *infuſed* immediately into the Soul, by a *Phyſical* work of the Spirit. But this is that which the Doctor contends for, *viz.* that Regeneration is

P. 261.

P. 268.

Imme-

Immediately, and by conſequence Irreſiſtibly cauſed by a *Phyſical* work of the Spirit in all that are Regenerated; and that none can be Regenerated otherwiſe. Now to ſtate the difference between him and us in this point.

First, Let us conſider in what ſence the Term *Phyſical* is to be underſtood; for it ſeems to be very unfitly uſed in this Queſtion. It ſignifies *Natural*, and therefore is by no means fit to expreſs a work, which the Doctor himſelf ſaith is *ſupernatural*. Again, the common uſe of it is to ſignifie the Natural Operations of *Bodies* one upon another; and therefore no more fit to expreſs the Operations of the Holy Spirit upon the *Soul*, than Reaſoning and Perſwading is to expreſs the Motions of Matter. Laſtly, the Scripture doth not once uſe this term, to ſignifie the work of the Spirit upon the Souls of men; which the Doctor ought not to have forgotten, when he quarrel'd with us for expreſſing *Holineſs* ſometimes by the *practice of Moral Virtue*. The
P. 459. *name or expreſſion it ſelf*, ſaith he, of Moral Virtue, *is forreign to the Scripture, not once uſed by the Holy Ghoſt, to denote that Obedience which God requireth of us*. So I ſay, the Name and Expreſſion it ſelf of a *Phyſical work*, is forreign to the Scripture, not once uſed by the Holy Ghoſt, to denote that Grace, which God hath promiſed to us: And which is ſomething more, the Name or Expreſſion itſelf is not at all proper to denote it. One would think therefore the Doctor muſt grant his uſe of this expreſſion to be *Metaphorical*; which uſe of words ought to be avoided as much as may be in Controverſies. But it ſeems to be as ill-choſen a *Metaphor* as one ſhall eaſily

eaſily meet with, as I have ſhewn by the unfitneſs of the word to expreſs what the Doctor means. I ſuppoſe he may pretend ſome Reaſon for the choice of it, from the Scriptures expreſſing the Converting Operations of the Spirit, by *Creating* and the like. But *Creating* and *Raiſing from the Dead*, are *ſupernatural* works, and the Operations not of *Bodies*, but of God who is a Spirit, and therefore much more apt to expreſs the Operations of the Holy Ghoſt in Converting, than the term, *Phyſical*. But the Doctor is not content to let it go for a *Metaphorical* Expreſſion; for, ſaies he, *The Operation of the Spirit by Motives and Arguments to influence the Will and Affections, is Moral, and ſo Metaphorical; not Real, Proper, and Phyſical.* P. 261. So that in ſpight of common ſenſe, and the ordinary uſe of words, the only way, that we know of, by which a mans Minde is proper to be wrought upon, muſt be *Metaphorical*; and that Operation only which is proper to Bodies, ſhall indeed be accounted a proper Operation upon the Minde. But not to aggravate this misfortune of the Doctor any farther; the only Reaſon, I can think of, which doth at all warrant his uſe of this Term, is, that it doth expreſs well enough *ſuch an Operation as hath nothing in it of Inſtruction and Perſwaſion*; and upon that account, it is well enough *oppoſed* to Moral. If the Doctor ſhould ask me, whether I know any expreſſion more proper upon all accounts than this, for ſuch a work as he intends; I muſt acknowledge that I do not: And I doubt it will be very hard for any man to finde out a proper Term for it. He means a work that hath no more in it of Argument, or Perſwaſion, than the juſtling of *Epicurus* his Atomes, and upon this account

account he calls it a *Phyſical* work: And after this premonition concerning the unfitneſs of the Term upon other accounts, I ſhall ſtill call it a *Phyſical* work with him.

Firſt then, we do not ſay, that there is any *Phyſical* work of the Spirit upon the Mindes of men, *neceſſary* to Regeneration, and this becauſe the Scripture hath ſaid no ſuch thing.

Secondly, neither do we ſay on the other hand, that there is *no Phyſical* work of the Spirit upon men in order to their Regeneration; and this likewiſe, becauſe the Scripture is ſilent on this ſide too. God has in general promiſed to us the Internal and gracious aids of the Holy Spirit, but the manner of his Operations is not defined in the Scriptures; ſomething concerning it may be gathered by conſequence from other divine Truths, as I have already ſhewn in the Firſt Part. But I do not ſee that it is inconſiſtent with any divine Truth, to ſuppoſe that the Holy Spirit, by a work wherein there is nothing of Inſtruction or Perſwaſion, may *elevate the minde*, as the Doctor ſpeaks, that is, make the Underſtanding more apprehenſive, and the Will more pliable, that his *moral* operations may take place more effectually. But

Thirdly, we ſay that ſuch a *Phyſical* work as doth *immediately*, and therefore *irreſiſtibly* cauſe Regeneration, is not neceſſary thereunto: And that the Operations of the Spirit do not convert all the converted, in ſuch a manner as God created the World, and as he will raiſe the dead to life. Such a *Phyſical* work we deny, and the reaſons

reaſons why we do ſo, I offered in the laſt Chapter of the Firſt Part. In ſhort, we contend that the Spirit doth internally inſtruct, move, and perſwade: we do not deny that by a *Phyſical* operation he doth *ſupernaturally elevate the minde*; but we deny that Regeneration muſt be the effect of a Phyſical, and that an immediate and irreſiſtible operation. This is the true ſtate of the difference between us: And now it belongs to me to ſhew that our Perſwaſion is not liable to that Conſequence which the Doctor hath charged upon it, *viz.*

SECT. 2.

That *it aſcribes the whole glory of our Converſion unto our ſelves, and not to the Grace of God.* And elſewhere, That *if the Holy Ghoſt doth not infallibly determine the will, and produce in us a principle of Faith and Obedience by ſuch an act as the Will cannot hinder the efficacy of, then all the glory of our Converſion is to be aſcribed unto our ſelves.* This Objection is ſo frequently and confidently made, that I intend to examine the grounds of it as throughly as I can. The Doctor has added very little proof of it, beſides his own Confidence, which I ſhall not oppoſe any other way, than by ſhewing him what little reaſon there is for it.

P. 262.

P. 284.

In the firſt place I obſerve, that to make the Conſequence look as odious as he could, he has expreſt it very odly, *viz.* that we muſt aſcribe the *whole* glory of our Converſion to *our ſelves*, and not to the Grace of God. If we take the

whole glory to our ſelves, we aſcribe no part of it to God. If it be our fault that we do not aſcribe the *whole* to God, but onely ſome part, he ſhould not have taxed us for taking the whole to our ſelves. But the Objection carries a great ſhow of piety, and is therefore to be carefully conſidered. If his meaning be, that whereas we ought to give the whole glory to God, we muſt in conſequence from our Principles take it all to our ſelves, as I think this is his meaning: Then I ſay the Conſequence is very falſe, which I ſhall ſhew, Firſt, with reference to the former Part, concerning aſcribing the whole glory to our ſelves, Secondly, To the latter, of not aſcribing the whole to God; under both which Heads, I ſhall endeavour not onely to anſwer that little which the Doctor hath ſaid to defend his Conſequence; but to ſpeak more fully to the point, by ſhewing ſome of the true grounds upon which the glory of our Converſion is to be aſcribed unto God.

He pretends to prove both parts of the Conſequence by one Argument, which is this. For
P. 262. *that act of our Wills whereby we convert unto God, is* (upon our ſuppoſition) *merely an act of our own, and not of the Grace of God*; therefore *we aſcribe the whole glory to our ſelves*, &c. To which I anſwer, Firſt, That if he means Converſion to be *merely an act of our own* in this ſence, that *we* onely can be ſaid to be converted, not the *Grace* of God; then it follows no more from our Principles than from his, that the whole glory is taken to our ſelves: For, that Converſion is merely an act of our own in this ſence, will not be directly denied by any man. Secondly, If he means

means that we make Converſion to be the mere effect of our own mindes, becauſe we do not make it to be an effect produced by Grace, and by nothing elſe, the Conſequence is very falſe; inaſmuch as Converſion being the effect of one of theſe cauſes, hinders not but that it may be the effect of the other alſo. But Thirdly, if he means that we do not make the act of Converſion to be at all the effect of Grace, then I grant, that if this follows upon our ſuppoſition, it follows alſo that we aſcribe the whole glory to our ſelves. But that our ſuppoſition excludes the act of Converſion from being at all the effect of Gods Grace, is manifeſtly falſe. For,

1. We do in great part aſcribe Converſion to the Grace of God, merely upon this account, becauſe we ſay and believe that it *is truly and properly the effect of Gods Word revealed to us in the Goſpel.* The Doctor knows that the Goſpel is frequently called *the Grace of God*, in the New Teſtament. He knows likewiſe that we impute Converſion to this Grace: for he is angry with us for aſcribing more to it than he does himſelf; therefore he of all men ſhould not pretend that we make Converſion to be merely an effect of our own ſtrength, and not at all of the Grace of God. Nor ſhould he ſay therefore that we aſcribe the whole glory of our Converſion to our ſelves.

If Converſion were the Effect of no other kinde of Grace, than that of the Revelation of the Goſpel, we might reaſonably, and we ought humbly to aſcribe it, incomparably more to the Grace of God than to our ſelves; and to ſay, *Not unto us, O Lord,*

not unto us, but unto thy Name be the Glory given. I doubt not but *Pelagius*, and his followers, were greatly miſtaken in making all the Grace, which God affords towards our Converſion, to conſiſt, as they *phraſed* it, *in Lege & Evangelio*, or in the Revelation of Divine Truth. But I muſt needs ſay, that their Adverſaries ſeemed not to have any juſt ground from *hence*, to charge them with aſcribing the Glory of Well-doing to themſelves. This had been enough to exclude *Boaſting*, that our Obedience proceeds from Faith, or from our belief of that Covenant of Grace, which was ratified by the Sacrifice of *Chriſt*'s Death, and the purpoſe whereof flowed from the mere Grace and Mercy of God. Thus the Apoſtle told the *Epheſians*, *By Grace are ye ſaved, through Faith; and that not of your ſelves; it is the Gift of God: Not of Works, leſt any man ſhould boaſt. For we are his workmanſhip, created in Chriſt Jeſus unto good Works*, &c. Epheſ. 2. 8, 9, 10. *By Grace are ye ſaved*, that is, as you may ſee by verſ. 4, 5. *Quickened from treſpaſſes and ſins*; through *Faith*, that is, through the preaching of the Goſpel to you, which you have believed; καὶ τοῦτο οὐκ ἐξ ὑμῶν, for *this is not of your ſelves*, but the *Gift of God*. And this is farther argued, becauſe it was not *for their works*, that God had called them to the Faith of the Goſpel. Not for their Works antecedent to Faith; for before they believed, they were *dead in treſpaſſes and ſins*: Not for their Works conſequent to believing, for the reaſon following: *For we are his Workmanſhip, created in Chriſt Jeſus unto good Works.* Good works are the fruits of believing in *Chriſt*, by which Faith we became New Creatures; and therefore theſe cannot be ſaid to merit or procure the Grace of the

the Goſpel. Thus elſewhere the Apoſtle deſcribing the Grace of God towards Mankinde, expreſſed by the Goſpel, argues the freeneſs of that Grace from hence, that he was not moved by any works of ours to that *Kindneſs and Love which appeared towards us. Not by works of righteouſneſs which we have done, but according to his mercy he ſaved us*, Tit. 3. 4, 5. So likewiſe he infers, that the Inheritance which God promiſed to *Abraham* and to his true Poſterity, is confer'd of Grace, becauſe it is of Faith. *It is of Faith, ἵνα κατὰ χάριν, that it might be* (or rather, *and ſo it is*) *of Grace*, Rom. 4. 16. Therefore our *Obedience* proceeding from the belief of the Covenant, which ſaies, *Bleſſed are they whoſe Iniquities are forgiven, and whoſe Sins are covered*, verſ. 7. is from Grace; becauſe it is of this Faith. Finally, the ſame Apoſtle directing us how to *withſtand the wiles of the Devil*, by being *ſtrong in the Lord, and in the power of his might*, explains himſelf thus: *Stand, having your loins girt about with Truth; and having on the breaſtplate of Righteouſneſs; and your feet ſhod with the preparation of the Goſpel of peace: Above all, taking the ſhield of Faith, wherewith ye ſhall be able to quench the fiery darts of the wicked; and take the Helmet of Salvation, and the Sword of the Spirit, which is the Word of God*, Epheſ. 4. By which it plainly appears, that the principal ſtrength of a Chriſtian lies in the belief of Saving Truth, and that this is to be ſtrong not of our ſelves, but *in the Lord, and in the power of his might*; and therefore to him ſhould the praiſe of our victory be given.

If then Converſion and Obedience be aſcribed by us to the Faith of the Goſpel; If we ſay

with St. *John*, *This is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith:* we do thereby aſcribe the glory of it to God, of whoſe gift it cometh that we believe.

What is thus teſtified by Scripture, ſeems plain from the reaſon of the thing. Unleſs we had been able to have procured a Sacrifice for the expiation of our paſt offences; Unleſs we could have offered valuable conſiderations to God, why he ſhould enter into a covenant of Mercy with us; Unleſs we could ſatisfie his Honour and Holineſs, and repair the wrongs which we had offered to his Authority and Dominion, and redeem our ſelves out of the hands of his offended Juſtice; though we ſhould not onely equal, but excel the piety and vertue of St. *Paul*, who *could do all things*; yet with him alſo we muſt acknowledge, that it is *through Chriſt ſtrengthning us.* And this although he had ſupplied us with no other ſtrength but that of Faith, *viz.* by aſſuring us of that Mercy and Bounty of God towards us, which he hath revealed, and which it was free for him to have extended towards us, or not; by aſſuring us, that with the good pleaſure of God he hath offered up himſelf a Sacrifice for our ſins; and in a word, by aſſuring us of that gracious Covenant which was wholly the effect of Gods mere goodneſs, and the Undertakings of our Mediator.

More particularly; ſuch are the motives and inducements to obedience, which God hath ſet before us in his Word, that we cannot with any modeſty impute our beſt performances in Religion to our own glory; ſeeing there is no proportion

portion between the utmoſt that we can do in the ſervice of God, and between thoſe Reaſons wherewith God hath excited us thereunto. This may be ſufficiently proved by one inſtance, *viz.* the *Promiſe of Eternal Life.* Whoever offers to another a Reaſon hitherto unknown, which being rightly conſidered, will determine him to do ſome good thing which is required of him, ought to be allowed ſome ſhare of the Praiſe which belongs to the action: But if that Reaſon be the propoſal of ſo vaſt a reward as incomparably exceeds the ſervice, he that performs the ſervice has no reaſon to think highly of himſelf at all; he may applaud his own happineſs, he cannot magnifie his own virtue. But farther, if he that promiſes the reward, does it of his own mere goodneſs and charity, reaping no other advantage to himſelf from it than the pleaſure of doing good; and if he alone is able to confer it, then is the praiſe of that good which is done upon ſuch a motive, due to him that made the promiſe, ſo much more than to him that is perſwaded by it, that in compariſon nothing of it is due to the latter. If an Earthly Kingdom were promiſed to a Debauched liver, on condition of one weeks Sobriety, would any man think that his abſtinence, to which he had been perſwaded by the hope of ſo vaſt a Recompence, deſerved great commendation? But although there is ſome proportion between a few days, and a mans Life; yet between all the Kingdomes of the World, and the glory of them, on the one ſide, and between an Inheritance in the Kingdom of God, on the other, there is no more proportion than between Vanity and Perfection; than between a Moment and Eternity. Is it not plain

therefore, that whatſoever we do in God's ſervice, is to be imputed to the praiſe and glory of his Grace, who hath incited us thereunto by ſo free, ſo gracious, and ſo rich a Promiſe as that of Life everlaſting in his Kingdom?

For the better Illuſtration of which Argument, let us conſider thoſe words of St. *Paul*: *Our light affliction which is but for a moment, worketh for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of Glory*, 2 Cor. 4. 17.

In the firſt place, I think it will not be denied, that ſuffering meekly and conſtantly for the ſake of Truth and Goodneſs, is the beſt ſervice we can offer to God. St. *Peter* tells us plainly, *This is thank-worthy, if a man for conſcience towards God endure grief, ſuffering wrongfully*, 1 Pet. 2. 19. So that if any glory can be claimed to our ſelves, it ſhould ſeem to be moſt rightfully claimed upon the obedience of meek ſuffering for the Truth. Again, it is obſervable, that thoſe Afflictions which the Apoſtle calls *light*, and *for a moment*, were on his own part very great in themſelves, and of long continuance with reſpect to the time of mans life: So that he might reaſonably challenge as much thanks and praiſe of this kinde, or perhaps more than any mere man ever did. Witneſs what himſelf ſaith, *In labours I am more abundant, in ſtripes above meaſure, in priſons more frequent, in deaths oft. Of the Jews five times received I forty ſtripes ſave one: Thrice was I beaten with rods: Once was I ſtoned: Thrice I ſuffered ſhipwrack: A night and a day I have been in the deep: In journeyings often, in perils of waters, in perils of robbers, in perils by mine own countrymen, in*

in perils by the heathen, in perils in the city, in perils in the wilderneſs, in perils in the ſea, in perils among falſe brethren; in wearineſs and painfulneſs, in watchings often, in cold and nakedneſs, 2 Cor. 11. 23, &c. This certainly is a deſcription of Afflictions long and heavy, both in weight and number: And bearing them as we ought, is ſuch an argument of Piety, that the Apoſtle might well ſay, *If I muſt needs glory, I will glory of the things which concern my infirmities*, v. 30. *I am become a fool in glorying, but ye have compelled me*, Ch. 12. v. 11. And if a Chriſtian may glory in any thing, 'tis in this. Yet in this very Epiſtle, he calls all this Affliction *light*, and accounts it to be but *for a moment*; and the reaſon why he doth ſo, is contained in the following words, that *it worketh a far more exceeding and eternal weight of Glory*.

Now firſt, it is no ſuch great matter to bear a *light affliction*; much leſs to bear that which is in itſelf *light*, and of *no long continuance*; leaſt of all, if it endures but *for a moment*. No man can challenge praiſe or thanks for ſo ſlight a thing. Wherefore, Secondly, if Afflictions otherwiſe heavy and long, are rendred light and momentany, by the promiſe of a far more exceeding and eternal weight of Glory; then the praiſe of bearing ſuch Afflictions conſtantly and meekly, is incomparably more due to him that made the promiſe, than to him that is ſupported by it; becauſe to the latter they are but light and momentany; and it is the gracious Promiſe of the former that hath made them ſo, though in themſelves they are conſiderably long and grievous. Wherefore upon this account the glory of our ſuffering

ſuffering the greateſt perſecutions, is to be given to God, *viz.* becauſe God hath propounded to us thoſe *Eternal things that are not ſeen*, which infinitely outweigh theſe Temporal things that are ſeen; rendring not onely the greateſt ſenſual Pleaſures of Life contemptible, but the greateſt Afflictions thereof very ſupportable.

It is for the ſame reaſon that our Saviour exhorted his Diſciples to *Rejoyce, and be exceeding glad*, when they were perſecuted. Has any man reaſon to rejoyce in Calamities that befal him? Or can thoſe Calamities be very conſiderable under which a man may rejoyce, and be exceeding glad? No certainly, if they be lookt upon without relation to ſomething elſe: But being compared with the end to which they lead, they are not onely inconſiderable, and very tolerable, but cauſes of joy; *Rejoyce and be exceeding glad, for great is your reward in Heaven*, Matth. 5. Our Lord bids them, as there was great reaſon, to rejoyce in their happineſs; he does not bid them, there being no reaſon for that, to glory in their Virtue: For they had ſo much cauſe given them to rejoyce, that there was no pretence left for boaſting.

And therefore St. *Paul* could not reckon up the Afflictions he had gone through for the ſake of the Goſpel, without a modeſt regret, and ſeeming to himſelf to have done *fooliſhly*; *I am become a fool in glorying, ye have compelled me:* They had compell'd him to it, who undervalued him, and, to their own harm, prefer'd others before him: *I am*, ſays he, *in nothing behinde the very chiefeſt Apoſtles:* yet he remembred withal, that he ought

ought to abaſe himſelf before God; and therefore he addes, *though I am nothing*; i. e. have merited no thanks from God for all that I have done or ſuffered. And one reaſon why he choſe to *glory rather in his infirmities*, i. e. in his afflictions, was, as he told them, *v. 9. That the power of Chriſt might reſt upon him*, i. e. that to the *glory of Chriſt* he might appear to them to be an example of that power and ſtrength which *Chriſt* had given him to go through ſo many trials of patience and conſtancy. In a word, when upon good reaſon, he was fain to compare himſelf with other men, he repreſented his afflictions to have been very great, as in truth they were; but when he compared them with the promiſed rewards of Patience, he repreſents them to be light and momentany, as in truth they were alſo; and therefore, though he ought to have been commended by the Church at *Corinth*, v. 11. for the former reaſon, yet he would not pretend to be any thing before God for the latter.

Seeing then that the promiſe of endleſs life and happineſs cutteth off all pretence of *glorying* before God, when for his ſake we ſuffer the ſharpeſt perſecutions; much more will it make the praiſe of all other acts of Obedience, as being not ſo difficult, to become due to him, in the firſt place, who hath by the offer of ineſtimable rewards induced us thereunto.

Seeing likewiſe, that this Motive is, of itſelf, ſufficient for this purpoſe, how much more when it is conſidered, as implying the promiſe of Forgiveneſs of ſins; as made to wretches obnoxious to the angry Juſtice of God; as enforced by the threatning

threatning of endleſs Puniſhments; as including Salvation from thoſe Puniſhments; Finally, as joyned with many other inducements, each of them very forcible and prevailing; that is, with God's ſending his own Son to call us to Repentance, with the mean condition to which he ſtoopt, and the bitter Sufferings which he underwent for our Redemption; with that excellent example which he hath ſet before us; with thoſe affectionate Exhortations, Expoſtulations and Intreaties, whereby God in his Word hath expreſt the tenderneſs of his Love towards us: Laſtly, with thoſe *abundant* Teſtimonies, whereby God hath ſo plentifully aſſured us, that he hath indeed ſpoken to us by his Son? For, that Providence was ſo greatly concerned in manifeſting the Truth, by the fulfilling of moſt antient Prophecies, by innumerable Signs and Wonders, by ſeveral ways of Divine Teſtimony, is a great Motive to awaken our Attention, and to conſtrain us to Obedience. I ſay, the promiſe of Eternal Life, joyned with theſe, and many more Inducements to Repentance and Obedience, all of them very ſtrong and perſwading, every one whereof is made known to us in the Word of God, and every one the Effect of his Free Grace, of his unſought and undeſerved good Will and Pleaſure, doth yet more evidently make the glory of our Converſion and Obedience become due to God, in the firſt place; of whoſe Grace it is, that we are thus perſwaded.

Seeing therefore that we believe Regeneration or Converſion to be effected in us by the Power of God's Word, and the Motives of the Goſpel; it cannot with any Juſtice be charged

ged upon us, that we aſcribe *the whole Glory* of our Converſion to *our ſelves*; unleſs it could be made to appear, that we are ſuch ſtupid and ſenſeleſs things, that we cannot apprehend the plaineſt, or diſcern the cleareſt Conſequences: Since no man of ordinary apprehenſion can aſcribe Converſion to God's Word, but he may underſtand that he thereby doth in great part aſcribe the Glory of it to God. Why then doth not Dr. *O.* acknowledge that we do the latter, when he knows that we do the former? Why on the other hand doth he pretend, that in effect we aſcribe the *whole* glory of Converſion to our ſelves? Not, one would think, becauſe he doth not ſee the injuſtice of this charge; but becauſe he is reſolved to be unjuſt to his Adverſaries: Or, if the former, then ſurely it muſt be from hence, that the Underſtandings of able men are ſometimes ſo corrupted and betraid by Anger, and Faction, and Reſolution to ſerve a Cauſe, that they cannot make a right Judgment of the Truth or Falſhood of the plaineſt Propoſitions.

But to prevent cavilling, I muſt adde, that it doth not follow from any thing that I have ſaid under this Head, that the bare propoſal of Motives in the Holy Scriptures, or by the Miniſtry of Men, is ſufficient for Converſion by it ſelf. For I affirm only, that if this were ſufficient, the praiſe of our Converſion were upon that account to be aſcribed chiefly unto God; and if that be true, 'tis a plain Argument, that we who aſcribe Converſion to the Motives of God's Word, as to one Cauſe and Means of it, are, for this reaſon, unjuſtly charged with aſcribing the *whole Glory* of Con-

Converſion to *our ſelves*. But much more unjuſtly, if it be conſidered, that

2. We aſcribe Converſion to the *Internal Operations* alſo of the Holy Spirit, applying the Motives of Religion to our Mindes, and with them perſwading us to Convert. That we are enlightned with the knowledge of *Chriſt*, cometh of his Gift, who diſpoſeth us to learn the Truth: That we attend to the Word of God, that we are wrought into a ſerious and conſiderate temper; that our Faith is made preſent to our Mindes; that we are excited to good Reſolutions; that we are confirmed in them; that we finde pleaſure in the performance of our duty; that we are gradually led on to every good work, cometh of his Grace, who by his inſenſible Operations, putteth good thoughts into our Mindes, repreſenteth Divine Truths more clearly to our Underſtandings, and thereby moveth our Wills and Affections more powerfully than Man can do. If therefore *the External Revelation* of Divine Truths, though it were all the Grace of God towards us, in order to Converſion, had made it our Duty to give him the Glory; much more the *Internal Application* of them by the Operations of the Holy Spirit.

If indeed the Doctor had any good reaſon for pretending, as he doth, that *no real Aid, and internal ſpiritual Strength, either is or can be conferr'd* P. 262. *by the Spirit, or Grace of God, working by Reaſons and Motives, and Arguments, and no otherwiſe.* If this, I ſay, were true, then the *Glory* of our Converſion were not indeed due unto God, upon the account of ſuch Grace; becauſe it gave no

real aid, or *ſpiritual ſtrength* towards it, that is, no help, or ſtrength at all. But this is a bold and impious ſaying. Where does he finde in the Scripture, that if the Holy Spirit only inſtructs and perſwades by his internal Operations, he confers no real aid thereby towards our Converſion? It had been more pardonable if he had affirmed only, that this was not *all* the real aid he contributed towards it; and yet this had been as preſumptuouſly ſaid, as to have affirmed the contrary, becauſe the Scripture is ſilent in the Queſtion: But to deny any benefit at all in thoſe Operations of the Spirit, is a venture beyond all modeſty. A Miniſter that reaſoneth and perſwadeth out of Gods Word, confers a *real aid* towards the converſion of the ſinner whom he perſwades: Shall not the Holy Spirit of God be ſaid to help and ſtrengthen, when he does the ſame more effectually? More effectually, I ſay; for 'tis another of the Doctors ſhameleſs ſayings, that he who ſuppoſeth the Operations of the Spirit to conſiſt onely in Inſtruction and Perſwaſion, *allows the Spirit of God no more power nor efficacy in or towards our Regeneration, than in a Miniſter who preacheth the Word, or in an Orator, who eloquently and pathetically perſwades to Virtue, and dehorts from Vice:* which is plainly to make himſelf or his Adverſaries guilty of Blaſphemy, in equalling the wiſdom and power of a mere man in inſtructing and perſwading, to the Wiſdom and Power of the Holy Ghoſt.

His friend Mr. *H.* is of another minde, who tells us that he believes Converſion to be wrought by an *Omnipotent Perſwaſion* of the Spirit. He thinks the perſwaſion of the Spirit can do all: Diſq. p. 87.

the

the Doctor on the other ſide thinks it can do *Nothing*. But whereas Mr. *H.* does alſo think that it is not merely by *moral Suaſion*, but that there is alſo a *Phyſical Operation*; I have already ſaid that it may be ſo for ought we know: but I do not ſee how he can account a *Phyſical* Operation needful, who ſuppoſeth Perſwaſion to be Omnipotent: Nor how he can make a *Phyſical* Operation to be part of the Omnipotent Perſwaſion, as he ſeems to do; becauſe ſuch an Operation hath nothing in it of the Nature of Perſwading.

But to return to the Doctor; could one expect from a Writer that ſeems to be ſo jealous for the glory of Gods Grace, that he ſhould make no better account of the *Word of God*, and the *application thereof by the Spirit*, than that they confer no aid and ſtrength towards Converſion? For what is this but to tell men, that they are unprofitable Gifts, and to lead them into that impiety of denying all thoſe thanks and praiſes to God, which ſuch ineſtimable Graces require from us. Surely, though you pretend that ſomething farther is done by the Holy Spirit towards our Converſion, yet it had been more modeſt and humble, and more ſuitable to your pretence of being tender of Gods Glory, to have acknowledged that if God had done no more for us than by his Word, and the perſwaſion of the Holy Spirit, and our Converſion had been wrought by theſe means onely; this were enough to have excluded Boaſting, and made the glory of our Converſion become due to him. And this I think any man would have ſaid, that had not been leſs concerned for the glory of God than for the glory of his own Opinion. Eſpe-

Eſpecially ſince there are divers other means (ſubordinate indeed to theſe principal cauſes) whereby God traineth us up to his Fear, and leadeth us to Repentance; which likewiſe, without the help of your principles, may ſhew how very unreaſonable it is for man, when he doth what God requires, to think highly of himſelf. I mean the innumerable ways of his wiſe and good *Providence* towards us, whereby we are either prepared for Inſtruction, or awakened to Attention, and diſpoſed to Conſideration, or admoniſht of our Sins, and quickned in the performance of our Duty. In theſe reſpects, while he does more for ſome than others, he does very much for all; and if we obſerve it not, 'tis our great ſtupidity; if we do not give him the praiſe, it is foul ingratitude. To this kinde of Grace it is that we are to aſcribe the benefits of good Education, of religious Friends and Companions, of an honeſt Calling and Employment, and of every paſſage in our converſation with others, from whence we might reap inſtruction. Hereto belongs the diſpoſal of our outward condition in any reſpect, when God is pleaſed either to prove our Thankfulneſs and Ingenuity, by the comforts of this Life, and making our condition eaſie and proſperous; or to check our Wantonneſs, by ſending us ſeaſonable Correction, to make us more tractable by ſoftening us upon the Bed of Sickneſs; and then to try what uſe we have made of ſuch Warnings, by giving us time to perform our promiſes of new Obedience. Finally, every Diſpenſation of Gods Providence towards us, who in his wiſdom knows what is beſt for every one of us, is Gods Grace: To which if we adde the conſideration of his Patience, in bearing ſo long

with our Perverſeneſs, and ſtill waiting for our amendment, while he importuneth us in the miniſtry of his Word, while he ſolliciteth us by the motions of his good Spirit, while he inſtructeth and admoniſheth us by the variety of his Providences: For even this Forbearance is *goodneſs leading to Repentance*, as the Apoſtle tells us, *Rom.* 2. 4. I ſay, if we lay together all theſe methods of Gods Grace towards us in order to our ſpiritual welfare, and if we heartily believe them, we bereave our ſelves of all pretence to boaſt of any thing that is good in us. And concerning all theſe inſtances of Gods Grace it is plain, that they are conſiſtent with that liberty in man, which makes the Good, or the Evil that we do, to become our own free Actions, and the effects of our own Choice.

This is all I ſhall ſay in Anſwer to the Fifth Part of the Conſequence which you would faſten upon our Doctrine concerning the Grace of God in Converſion, *viz.* that it aſcribes the *whole glory* of Converſion to *our ſelves*.

SECT. 3.

I come now to the Second, *viz.* that it does *not* aſcribe the *whole* glory thereof unto God. In anſwer to which, it may be obſerved,

1. That our way ſuppoſeth God to be the *Original* cauſe of Converſion, inaſmuch as he thereunto calleth us by his Word, inviteth us by his Promiſes, and moveth us by his Holy Spirit, while yet we are in a ſtate of ſin and miſery; and this no

not then only, when we are careleſs, or but once, when at firſt he affords this Grace to us; but conſtantly *preventing* us *in all that we do* towards Converſion, by leading us to *it*: So that our Doctrine doth *Originally* aſcribe the *whole Glory* to God.

2. That upon the Grounds already laid down, we do *Comparatively* aſcribe the whole glory of Converſion, and of all the Good we do, to the Grace of God, and nothing of it to our ſelves. *Comparatively*, I ſay, for ſome praiſe and commendation doth belong to the Convert; but that ſo little in reſpect of that Glory which is due to God, that it may be well ſaid to be none at all. This is fully expreſt by St. *Paul*, in that Saying, *I laboured more abundantly, yet not I, but the Grace of God which was in me.* How could St. *Paul* ſay truely, that he had laboured, if he had not? Why then did he ſay alſo, that he did not labour, but becauſe the Grace of God had done ſo much for him, that he in compariſon, had done nothing at all? That which he had done, being ſimply conſidered, was what the *Corinthians ought to have commended him for*, as he himſelf ſaid. But in reſpect of the Grace of God which was with him, *he was nothing*; and no Commendation was due to him, not *abſolutely*, but *comparatively* none at all.

Our Saviour and his Apoſtles often commended the good actions of Men; and God will at laſt ſay to the Righteous Man, *Well done thou good and faithful Servant.* Therefore he that converts from his evil ways, and does that which is right in the ſight of God, is commendable.

For God does not judge of Things and Perſons otherwiſe than they are. If this therefore be the Conſequence charged upon our Opinion, that it makes ſome praiſe to belong to the Convert, we own the Conſequence, and challenge you to ſhew us any reaſon why we ſhould be afraid to do ſo. But if you pretend that our Perſwaſion aſcribes any ſuch Glory to our ſelves, that in *Compariſon* the *whole* is not given to God; we deny the Conſequence, and challenge you to prove it if you can. In the mean time this may be ſaid, to ſhew the Inconſequence of that Concluſion from our Principles, that becauſe that which we contribute towards our own Converſion, is according to the Grounds laid down before, ſo very little in reſpect of what God hath done and continues to do towards it, that in compariſon it may be ſaid to be nothing at all: Therefore that little praiſe which may be given to us, if we believe and obey, is ſo very little, that in compariſon, it may likewiſe be ſaid to be none at all. Where any thing is produced by ſome principal and over-ruling Cauſe, that hath a far greater Influence upon the Effect, than any of the reſt; it is uſual to aſcribe the Effect to that Cauſe, as if none elſe contributed towards it. 'Tis the *General* that gains the Victory; the *Magiſtrate* that ſecures the Peace; the *Architect* that builds the Houſe: yet ſomething is done by the Souldiers, by the Officers, and the Labourers. But theſe Similitudes do not reach the caſe in hand, and it is not eaſie to finde out one that can. There is in all theſe, and the like inſtances, ſome proportion between the principal, and leſs principal Cauſes: But there is no proportion between what God does on the one ſide, and we on the other,

other, for our Converſion. His Grace is incomparably more effectual than our work; and therefore when his Glory is ſhewn, the Glory of Man vaniſheth into nothing; as the Star-light diſappears, when the Sun is preſent. And that Doctrine gives all the Glory to God, which takes care, *That no Fleſh ſhould glory in his preſence*, 1 Cor. 1. 29. This I take to be the main Reaſon, why in our Converſion, God is ſaid to *Create*, and to *raiſe us from the Dead*; although alſo it is ſometimes affirmed of us, that we *Convert*, and *ſave our ſelves*, *viz.* becauſe our part in it, is nothing to his, and in compariſon the whole Effect is produced by him alone. But yet ſtill it is ſomething that we do. We are ſaid in Scripture *to repent* and *turn to God.* The Miniſters of God's word are ſaid to *Convert ſinners*, to be *Workers together with God*, to *ſave themſelves, and thoſe that hear them.* So that for ought I can ſee, the Scriptures do not in ſtrictneſs of Speech, aſcribe all to God. Are theſe expreſſions injurious to the Grace of God? We ſay no more than what theſe plainly import.

"Neither truely, *(to uſe the words of a notable "Authour)* ſhould theſe poor things of the Will "of man, whether wiſh or will, whether en- "deavour or labour, whether yielding or obey- "ing, have been once *named the ſame day*, that "Gods Grace and Works are praiſed, or have "been pleaded or contended for in theſe Diſputes, "had not there been a Neceſſity compelling "thereunto. They have compelled me, who un- "der a colour of magnifying the Grace of God, "and of bringing greater thanks to him, and of "juſtly reproving them that have been *Adula-*

Playf. Appel. Evang. p. 270.

" *tores Naturæ*, are turned themſelves *Adulatores* " *Gratiæ*; ſo far forth, as by them *Satan* ſeeketh " to ſubvert the Truth and Righteouſneſs of God, " and to extinguiſh and deſtroy all Piety and Re- " ligion amongſt men; bringing into the world " a ſtupid ſloth for ſome, a remorſeleſs infidelity " and impenitency for others, and an invincible " deſperation and hardneſs for other ſome; the " Natural off-ſpring of that Doctrine that takes " away all manner of freedom of Will from men " in matters of Salvation; that turns the Gene- " ral promiſes of the Goſpel into Particular and " Private; that limits an eſpecial kinde of Grace, " which is onely effectual to a few ſecret ones by " a direct Decree, the reſt being left deſtitute of " true Grace, though they be called by the word " of the Goſpel.

Suppoſing then a liberty in the Will of man, by which he might have remained Impenitent under the Operations of Grace; yet being converted by them, it does not follow that the whole glory of his Regeneration may reaſonably be aſcribed to himſelf, and not to the Grace of God. For on the contrary it is evident, that with this Suppoſition we do juſtly aſcribe the whole glory unto the Grace of God, and, conſidering the abundance of that Grace, nothing to our ſelves.

But Mr. *Humfrey* (to do him right) has offered an Argument (or rather two) that ſeems to prove the latter part of the Conſequence, *viz.* that we do not upon our Principles give the whole Glory to God in compariſon to what we aſſume to our ſelves. The Argument is this: That

That upon our Suppoſition, it is man that *makes the difference between himſelf and another.* And it may be ſaid the *greateſt Glory* is due to him that makes the Difference. Again; *Upon our Hypotheſis, that which leaſt conduceth to mans ſalvation, is attributed to God; and that which is moſt conducive thereunto, is aſcribed unto man himſelf. For it is more to believe and repent, than 'tis to have power to believe and repent; for the Promiſe of Life and Salvation, is not made to him that is enabled to believe, but to him that does believe, and obey the Goſpel.* But according to us, *the power onely which we have to believe and repent, is from God; but the act from our ſelves;* therefore *we aſcribe leſs to God than to man;* and by conſequence attribute more glory to our ſelves than to God. This indeed is ſomething, at leaſt in the Objector's opinion, who *adviſes* me *heartily to be very conſiderate what I anſwer to this Argument, for he has pickt it out, as that which he takes to be the moſt momentous of any which are ordinarily urged by* we *the Orthodox in this matter;* and he *does not doubt but to preſs it more cloſely if I ſhould give the occaſion.* If a man were apt to be frighted, this were enough to ſcare him from meddling in ſo hazardous an attempt: but if I do not go very conſiderately and warily to work againſt this *moſt momentous Argument*, I muſt confeſs that Mr. *H.* is not to blame, who has given me as fair warning as a reaſonable Adverſary can deſire.

Diſq. *p.* 68.

Ibid. *p.* 70.

To begin with the latter Argument, 1. I do abſolutely deny that it follows from our Principles, that the act of Converſion is onely from our ſelves, or the mere effect of man's Free-will. And this is that which Mr. *H.* muſt prove, if he

will make it good that we aſcribe the greater means of Salvation to our ſelves, and not to God. He affirms it indeed in thoſe words, that *we make believing it ſelf, that is, the greateſt thing to be what we have not received, but 'tis of our ſelves, or from our own ſtrength.* I ſuppoſe he reſerved the proof of it till *I ſhould give him occaſion to preſs it yet more cloſely.* In the mean time I will offer him an Argument to the contrary, out of his own Argument: One part whereof is this; That (as we ſuppoſe) God does confer no more than the power of Converting: Now therefore he gives that power at leaſt: Therefore the act of Converſion proceeds from that power which God gives: Therefore 'tis not merely of our own ſtrength that we actually convert, but by that which we have received from God. By giving *power* to convert, God may be truly ſaid to be the cauſe of the *act*: But becauſe Mr. *H.* has *adviſed* me to be *very conſiderate*, I think it not unfit to be added, that by *Power*, I do not mean that Power which God gives in *Nature*, the natural freedom of Will, which is the ſame in all men, but not ſufficient for Converſion; but that Power I mean, which God gives in *Grace*, to ſome more, to ſome leſs, to all that which is abundantly ſufficient. But Grace, though it does not properly determine my will, yet if I am reſolved to do the thing which God commands, it is the cauſe of my Determination. If a man offers me Arguments to perſwade me to do that which I have no inclination in me to do, and the Arguments are ſo preſſing that I yield to them, this yielding is *my* determination of my Will, and the Arguments are the cauſe of my putting my own natural power into Act. Now the Grace of God doing

doing that inwardly as well as outwardly, (which man does onely outwardly) by removing thoſe prejudices which hinder the Will from determining it ſelf well, and doing thoſe things which incline it to *exert its own Act*, may properly be ſaid to be the cauſe of our Act in Converſion. Which would be true, if Grace were afforded in no greater degrees than what were neceſſary to ſway the Will; much more when it is abundantly given, in exceeding great and precious Promiſes, and moſt weighty Arguments of ſeveral kindes, and likewiſe in the application of theſe by the Holy Spirit, not once for all, but continually; not onely to prepare the Will for Converſion by them, but to aſſiſt the Will in the Act of converting. But,

2. If Mr. *H.* pretends that we ſuppoſe the Act of Converſion to be ſo much from our ſelves, that it depends upon the uſe of our own Liberty; and by conſequence that we make man to be the cauſe of his own Converſion more than God: I Anſwer, 1. By granting the Antecedent; for we do not believe that God in converting does take away the natural freedom of the Will, or the proper uſe of that power which is conferred in Grace. 2. By denying the Conſequence; which is grounded upon this Propoſition, that, That cauſe without which, all things conſidered, the effect cannot be produced, is always the principal cauſe; which is a moſt falſe Propoſition. Many Cauſes may be neceſſary for the producing of an Effect, and yet one of them may contribute more towards it than all the reſt.

But any body may be made ſenſible of the pitiful

pitiful Sophiſtry of this Argument from the *Power* and the *Act*, by this plain Inſtance. Two perſons are guilty of Treaſon by the Sentence of the Law: The Prince offers a Pardon to both; and underſtanding that they are both likely to refuſe it, ſends fit perſons to both to convince and perſwade them. The one is perſwaded, and accepts: the other dies in his obſtinacy. I ask now, Doth he that is perſwaded to accept the Pardon contribute ſo much to the ſaving of his own life, as in the leaſt to derogate from the Grace and Mercy of his Prince? And were he not a ſenſeleſs and ungrateful wretch, that for this reaſon ſhould aſcribe all or the moſt to himſelf, and little or nothing at all to his Princes goodneſs and Clemency? And yet if Mr. *H*'s. Argument, from the *Power* and the *Act*, be good for any thing, this man talks reaſonably. For the Prince did no more than put it into his *Power* to ſave his own Life, and uſe proper means to perſwade him; but the ſaving of his life was at laſt his own Act. Away with theſe *Metaphyſical* ſubtleties that are againſt common ſence.

The *Act* (he ſays) *is more than the Power*: And ſo it muſt needs be, if it includes the Power, as it always does. But in plain Engliſh, who diſchargeth my Debt, he that gives me the Money, or I that accept it and tell it out to the Creditor? He gives the *Power*, I do the *Act*. In all grateful and reaſonable conſtruction, he ought to have the credit and thanks that enabled me to pay it.

Mr. *H.* may poſſibly *preſs this Argument yet more cloſely*; in the mean time I proceed to the other, which is this: That

That ſince the uſe or neglect of that Power, which God gives to Convert, and by conſequence Actual Converſion it ſelf, is ſuppoſed to depend upon the Will of Man, as well as upon the farther Grace of God, it follows that a Man in his Converſion, makes himſelf to differ from him that is unconverted; and therefore that he contributes more towards his own Converſion than the Grace of God, which either is or might have been common to both. To this I anſwer, 1. By granting the former Conſequence, that Man indeed makes the Difference. 2. By denying the latter, that therefore he is the more principal Cauſe of his own Converſion.

Mr. *H.* thinks, that the former Conſequence is of it ſelf ſufficient to ſhew the weakneſs of our Principles: For, ſaies he, *that Man himſelf makes the difference between himſelf and another, is according to the judgment of moſt after* Auſtin, *flat againſt the Scripture. Who maketh thee to differ from another? And what haſt thou, that thou didſt not receive?* 1 Cor. 4. 7. To make a brief Digreſſion therefore from the main Argument. Diſq. p. 68.

1. I Anſwer, That this place is not to the purpoſe. The Apoſtle ſpeaks of thoſe Gifts, which God had variouſly diſtributed amongſt his Miniſters, for the edification of the Church. For theſe words contain a reaſon to enforce the Caution in the former verſe, *viz.* that *no one might be puffed up for one againſt another*, for *Paul* againſt *Apollos*, &c. as it appears they were, *chap.* 3. *verſ.* 4. Now indeed that the difference here mentioned, is to be underſtood of the Gifts of Tongues, and Prophe-

Prophecy, and the like, is granted by all: But thoſe whom this Gentleman calls *the moſt after* Auſtin, pretend that the Grace of Converſion is likewiſe meant. To which I reply: 1. That the ſcope of the place does not at all require it. 2. That no other Gifts but Miniſterial, and moſt of thoſe extraordinary, are meant in the places parallel to this, as in *Rom.* 12. 3. *Epheſ.* 4. 7, 8, &c. 1 *Cor.* 12. 4, to the 12. which places you may conſult at your leaſure. 3. That there is abundant Reaſon, why this Text *cannot be applied to the Gifts neceſſary to Salvation*, which I ſhall give you in the words of the forementioned Author. "God wills not that difference which "is between Believers and Unbelievers, under the "word of Faith, but would have all believe "and obey the Goſpel. This Difference offen- "deth and diſpleaſeth God, and it proceedeth as "much from the Diſobedience of him that be- "lieveth not, as from the Obedience of him that "believeth: But of that part of the Difference, "which is by diſobeying, God I trow is not the "Author. It is ſin and ſhame to him that wan- "teth Faith, after the means of Faith afforded "him; but no blame to him that ſpeaks not "with Tongues, or Prophecyeth not. Theſe "were ſuddenly given, and immediately, with- "out labour or means: But Faith, and the reſt "needful to Salvation, had means by which God "gave them, about which men might uſe a "different Diligence. I ſhall inſert this only, that in being endued with miraculous Gifts, a man muſt of neceſſity be *wholly paſſive*; it is not ſo in believing and repenting: He therefore that differs from another in the former reſpect, could contribute nothing towards the difference; but

App. Ev. p. 260.

he

he that differs in the latter, may do ſomething in the way of preparation, and endeavour towards it. The Text is therefore to be underſtood of the former, but cannot reaſonably be applied to the latter. To proceed with this Author; "When the Scripture ſpeaks of God's "*meaſuring to every man, as he will*, Rom. 12. 3, *&c.* "theſe places reſpect thoſe Gifts of the Holy "Ghoſt, that were given for the publick Service "of the Church; as if the meaſure of *Saving* "*Graces* being ſo ſmall as it is, proceeded from "Mens Negligence, rather than God's Diſpenſation. But admit that God putteth and approveth a different meaſure, even of Saving "Graces, yet the difference of an emptineſs, and "abſence of Faith, in them that hear the Word, "he putteth not, he approveth not. You may there finde more to the ſame purpoſe. I ſhall only adde what he ſaith in his entrance upon this matter. "As to the Queſtion when two are e-"qually called, and one Converteth, the other "not, (theſe both being ſuppoſed poſſible) who "it is that puts the Difference, God or Man; I "ground my Anſwer upon the righteous Judg-"ment of God, that Man puts the Difference, "not God; for that God judgeth not his own "Acts, but the Acts of men; and for that every "righteous Judge findes a difference, and doth not "make any between party and party. Thus much I have tranſcribed out of this Author, for the ſame reaſon that he wrote it, becauſe of the weight of the Argument; and let him remove it, that can.

But as he obſerved, and as Mr. *H.* intimates, it is St. *Auſtin* that hath made it *ſo ſcandalous* to ſay,

ſay, that a man makes himſelf to differ from another; and that by *wringing this place* of the Apoſtle, 1 Cor. 4. 7. Let St. *Auſtin* then be heard, who thus ſpeaks in comparing the caſes of *Pharaoh* and *Nebuchadnezzer*: *As to their Nature, both were men; as to their Dignity, both Kings; as to the Cauſe, both held Gods people in captivity; as to the Puniſhment, both were mildly admoniſht by Chaſtiſements. What then occaſioned their different ends? Nothing elſe, but that one of them ſenſible under Gods hand, groan'd under the memory of his own Iniquity; the other by his own free-will fought againſt the moſt merciful verity of God.* When you have anſwered St. *Auſtin* in this place, I will anſwer him in yours.

De Præd. & Gratia, *cap.* 15.

2. But to return to the Argument in hand; this being granted, that man makes himſelf to differ, it does not follow that he himſelf doth more towards his converſion than God doth for it. For that which makes the difference, or which is the cauſe why one man actually converts, whereas another doth not, who enjoys the ſame means with the former, may be much leſs than that cauſe which is common to both. A charitable man deſignes to redeem two Priſoners confin'd for an equal Debt, and withal to oblige them to ſome induſtry: He therefore lays down the incomparably greater part of the ſum that is to be diſcharged, and leaves them to work for the remaining inconſiderable part, furniſhing them alſo with means, whereby they may eaſily obtain it. One of them is glad of the opportunity, and works out his Liberty; the other is lazy, and remains a Priſoner. In this caſe, he that is redeemed makes the difference, and yet

it

it was very little in compariſon which he himſelf contributed towards his own Liberty. This may ſerve for an Inſtance to ſhew, That is not always greateſt which makes the difference; though, as I ſaid before, no Similitude can well expreſs the diſproportion between the Grace of God in converting us, and between all that we do towards it as free Agents; this latter being nothing in compariſon to the former, although the latter it be which makes the difference between the Righteous and the Wicked.

Thus I have examined the firſt Conſequence which the Doctor ſeeks to faſten upon our Perſwaſion, and that in both parts of it, ſhewing that we upon good grounds do not aſcribe the whole glory of Converſion to our ſelves, but that we do aſcribe it unto God. If you are reſolved not to ſee the unreaſonableneſs of this Charge, you had as good come ſtreight to the point, and ſay in plain terms, that you are reſolved not to give the glory to God, unleſs he will do all for you himſelf, and leave nothing for you to do in working out your Salvation. If you be aſhamed to ſay ſo, be ſo juſt as to grant that we may reaſonably do the one, though we do not believe the other.

Now by this time any one may ſee the bottom of all the Doctors Diſcourſe, which is this: That no thanks are due for a kindneſs, if he to whom it is done be not *merely Paſſive:* And if the Beneficiary be but ſo much as active in receiving and accepting of it, the whole grace of the kindneſs is loſt, and all the glory of it redounds to the Beneficiary, and none to the Benefactor

factor. If I offer to a man ready to periſh, Meat and Cloathing, yet according to the Doctor's Principles, this is no kindneſs at all, unleſs I put on his Clothes by force, and open his mouth, and feed him in ſpight of his Teeth, and cram the meat down his Throat. And the true Conſequence from this is, that the glory of Gods Grace wholly depends upon the ſullenneſs and obſtinacy of men; and that the onely way to advance it, is by a ſtout oppoſition, and ſpiteful reſiſtance of it.

SECT 4.

But ſince you have given the occaſion, I hope you will not take it ill if I go about to prove your Opinion by the ſame Teſt, that you have brought ours to, and to ſhew you which of them can beſt abide a Trial. And if God be more glorified by the profeſſion of that Doctrine which aſcribes Converſion to his Grace, as to the ſupreme cauſe, yet ſo as to ſuppoſe it likewiſe an effect of that freedom and choice which belongs to our Nature, than by that which makes Converſion to be the effect of an abſolute Decree, and an irreſiſtible Power, and impoſſible to be produced otherwiſe, according to the opinion of the Doctor and thoſe of his way; then we may hope for better uſage hereafter from theſe men who ſeem to be ſo jealous for the Glory of God.

I think, when Opinions are brought to this Touch-ſtone, it ſhould be firſt agreed, that the glory of God conſiſteth not onely in this, or that, but

but in all the perfections of the divine Nature; and that God is therefore moſt glorified by us, when we make the fulleſt and freeſt acknowledgments of all his Attributes. If therefore we are led by our Principles to yield all that glory to God which theſe men give him according to theirs, and moreover that Glory too which they do not; then is our Doctrine more for the glory of God than theirs is.

As to the former, it is obvious, to any man that hath concerned himſelf in this Controverſie, that thoſe Excellencies of the Divine Majeſty, which the Principles of theſe men pretend to be ſingularly careful and tender of, are the *Soveraign Dominion, and the irreſiſtible power of God.* His Soveraign Dominion, by which he can diſpoſe of us as he pleaſeth, doing what he will with his own. His irreſiſtible Power, by which he performeth what is otherwiſe impoſſible to be done, *creating* in us *new Hearts*, and *quickning* us who were *dead* in treſpaſſes and ſins, according to the proper and literal notion.

But God is as much glorified by us in theſe reſpects, though not upon the ſame Principles. For 1. we believe that God is the abſolute Soveraign of the whole World, and can do with us what he will; nor is it any diminution to his abſolute and Arbitrary Dominion, to ſay that he will uſe it wiſely and righteouſly. A good Prince may be as abſolute as a Tyrant, though the one rules with Clemency and Juſtice, the other with Cruelty and Iniquity. 2. In reſpect of God's Power, we glorifie him as much as if we ſaid the Grace by which he converts is an Om-

nipotent Act; becauſe we acknowledge his Omnipotence, as much as if we granted it were uſed for that end. We ſay that God can convert us in that manner they ſpeak of, if he pleaſes; ſo that the utmoſt they contend for, with reſpect to the glory of his Power, is yielded by us; for it is evident that power is not the leſs, for being not uſed upon ſome occaſion: ſo that the acknowledgement of God's Power is equal on both ſides.

But then the odds is very great if we go any farther, *viz.* to the conſideration of the Wiſdom, and Truth, and Juſtice, and Mercy of God, which are the Moral, and more excellent perfections of the Divine Nature. The Glory of God conſiſteth as much and more in theſe Attributes, than in his Soveraignty and Omnipotence. That our Doctrine provideth for his Glory in theſe reſpects, is ſo plain, that our Adverſaries make it no part of the Controverſie. Whether theirs do the ſame, is now to be conſidered.

1. Is the Wiſdom of God glorified by ſuppoſing him to convert man in a way unſutable to that Freedom, and thoſe Faculties, which belong to his Nature; or to chuſe thoſe means for the accompliſhment of our Redemption, which in ſome part undo the work of his own creation? But this ſeemeth to be the conſequence of that Opinion which makes Converſion to be ſtill the immediate effect of a *Phyſical* and Irreſiſtible act, as I have ſhewn in the Firſt Part, *p.* 282. If it be ſaid that man has brought himſelf to that paſs, that God cannot ſave him any other way; does not this, by the way, ſeem to be a bold

bold limitation of his Wiſdom and Power? But to let that paſs; Is it not a foul imputation againſt the wiſdom of God, to ſuppoſe that he hath appointed means for the recovery of Mankinde, which cannot in the leaſt degree be ſerviceable to the end? But ſuch is the Conſequence of that Opinion, which makes it as impoſſible for the ſinner to be converted, as for the Dead to be raiſed, by Motives and Arguments, which are yet part of thoſe means, God hath appointed for our Converſion. Now the converſion of a ſinner, according to this Hypotheſis, is as if God out of *Stones* (in the literal ſence) deſigning to *raiſe up Children unto* Abraham, ſhould ſend Miniſters to preach to theſe Stones, and perſwade them ſeveral years; and now and then by an act of Omnipotency turn a Stone into a humane Body, and infuſe a Soul into that Body, and grace into that Soul. The act of Omnipotence does the buſineſs, and all the reſt is Show and Pageantry. Thus they repreſent God to convert Sinners.

2. Is the Truth and Faithfulneſs of God glorified, by ſuppoſing that whereas the promiſes of Pardon and Salvation ſeem to be made ſincerely to all, without reſpect of perſons; yet in good earneſt they were meant to a few ſelect perſons onely, whom God deſigned to convert by his irreſiſtible Power? But ſuch is the conſequence of that Opinion, which makes the conditions of Pardon and Salvation utterly impoſſible to the reſt, as being not deſigned to be converted by Omnipotence.

3. Is the Juſtice of God glorified, by ſuppo-

ſing that he puniſhes men with more grievous Torments, for not accepting the offers of Grace in the Goſpel, though it was utterly impoſſible for them ſo to do, without that farther Grace which he purpoſed abſolutely to deny them? But ſuch is the conſequence of that Opinion, which reſolves the converſion of ſinners into that irreſiſtible power which is uſed upon a few, and the benefit thereof denied to all the reſt.

What ſhould I ſpeak of the Mercy of God?

Finally, it is not more for Gods glory, that the praiſe of the good which we do ſhould be aſcribed to his Grace, than that the ſhame of our evil doings ſhould reſt upon our ſelves, as our Conſcience indeed ſhews it doth, by puniſhing us with remorſe after we have committed ſin. But what reaſon there can be for this, unleſs you ſuppoſe it poſſible for the wicked to have been converted, and the good to have been better, I believe neither you nor I are able to imagine. If you aſcribe Converſion and Obedience to a cauſe that utterly excludes the Free-will of man, his evil actions are his *misfortunes*, but not his *faults*; and then I think you may eaſily ſee, that 'tis not for the glory of God to make any farther enquiry what ſhould be the cauſe of this evil.

You ſee what will come of it, if theſe Opinions are to be tried, as without all doubt they ought to be, by the proviſion they make for Gods glory.

After all, I believe that you, with us, do aſcribe the glory of infinite Wiſdom, and Truth, and

and Juſtice, and Mercy, and Holineſs, to the peerleſs Majeſty of God; and I hope you believe that we do heartily acknowledge his abſolute Dominion, and his irreſiſtible Power. But though we may thus anſwer *one for another*, we muſt yet anſwer *for our Opinions our ſelves.*

SECT. 5.

Whatever may be the event of this Diſpute, it ſhould not be forgotten, that although we may not be ſo well agreed, what Opinions concerning Grace are moſt for Gods glory; yet, thanks be to God, we are generally agreed what *Practices* and manner of Life make for it. And therefore although it may be of good conſequence, and no ill deſigne, to debate theſe points with regard to the glory of God, and the good of men; yet it ought ſtill to be remembred, that the knowledge of the Truth in theſe Queſtions, makes neither for the one nor the other, but as it leads to Obedience and a good Life, without which we do indeed deny God, while we profeſs to know him. A holy Life is the cleareſt and fulleſt acknowledgment of all the divine Perfections, and all our good words are but mockery without it.

We cannot more effectually confeſs the *Soveraign Authority* and *Dominion* of God, than by ſubmitting to his Will in all things; nor his *Omnipotence* and *Wiſdom*, than by relying upon him in all our troubles and diſtreſſes, never ſeeking to relieve our ſelves by any unlawful expedients, but depending upon him in the way of

our Duty, with Patience and Prayer: Nor can we more clearly acknowledge his *Juſtice*, than by ſhewing that we dare not turn it againſt our ſelves; nor his *Beneficence* and *Mercy* than by a thankful uſe of them, and improving thoſe opportunities of Repentance and Amendment, which are afforded by them; nor his *Truth* and *Faithfulneſs*, than by doing thoſe things to which his Promiſes are made, and avoiding thoſe that will expoſe us to his Threatnings; nor the *Goodneſs* and *Holineſs of his Nature*, than by keeping thoſe Laws, which being themſelves Holy, Juſt and Good, ſhew the Holineſs of his Will, who hath delivered them, and are themſelves beſt diſcerned to be ſuch in the practice of them; for which reaſons the Life of a Righteous man makes the trueſt and beſt report of the Goodneſs of God, that the world can receive from him. Laſtly, by Perſeverance in good Works, and a holy Life, we glorifie the *Power of Gods Grace* more than by our Opinions concerning the manner of his Operations in us. A Good Man does more than ſay, That through the Grace of God we may become New Creatures, and be preſerved in Holineſs to the end; for he is himſelf an undeniable Inſtance of it; ſhewing beyond contradiction, that neither the Hurt we have received by the Fall of our firſt Parents, nor the Prejudices of Senſe, nor the Allurements of the Fleſh, nor the Temptations of the World, nor the Suggeſtions of the Devil, nor the Enticements of Sinners, nor a multitude of evil Examples, nor any other cauſe of Danger added to all theſe, are of greater force than the Operations and Aids of the Holy Spirit, or muſt needs make our Duty too hard for us: While he that talks never

never ſo magnificently of the Grace of God, being himſelf a Slave to the Devil, and to his own Luſts, does as much as in him lies, to confute every word he ſaies, by his own practice.

I deſire it may be obſerved, that Converſion it ſelf does aſcribe more Glory to God than either your Opinion or ours concerning the manner of it; ſo little reaſon have you to be afraid leſt our Principles aſcribe the *whole Glory* of our Converſion to our ſelves, or deny it to God. No man can in words glorifie God's Grace more than St. *Paul* did by ſaying, *I can do all things through Chriſt, who ſtrengtheth me*; and the reaſon is, becauſe thoſe words, *I can do all things*, ſhewed what the manner and courſe of his Life was.

But if we contend who ſhould ſpeak, and believe, and lay down Propoſitions, which make moſt for the Glory of God's Grace; one would think we were all agreed in the general, that his Grace is exceeding abundant towards us, and that it will be our great Condemnation, if we fail of doing his Will, who hath ſo liberally imparted his Aſſiſtance towards it; that, therefore, we ſhould be aſhamed and afraid, while we ſpeak ſo much in praiſe of his Grace, to live ſo little to it: Eſpecially ſince we have the Examples of good Men, who can do all things through *Chriſt* that ſtrengthens them; to encourage us, who by the ſame means may arrive at the ſame perfection; or to rebuke us, who being of the ſame Nature, and invited by the ſame Promiſes, and induced by the ſame Motives, and capable of the ſame Grace, as being under the bleſſed Influence

and Guidance of the ſame Spirit, are not alike Converted or Improved in Holineſs.

Finally, If that Glory of God, whereof we are ſpeaking, be advanced moſt of all by our Good Lives, then it ſhould ſeem that thoſe Opinions, concerning his Grace, tend moſt to his Glory, which do moſt ſtrongly oblige us to the practice of Religion, which offer to men the greateſt encouragements to repent and obey the Goſpel, and leave thoſe moſt inexcuſable, who do not. And what theſe are, I leave the Dr. to conſider.

But, as I hinted before, we ſhall at laſt agree in this, I truſt, that as the Glory of God is that End, which ſhould indeed conclude all *Controverſies* about his Grace; ſo it ought to be that End, by which we ſhould determine all our *Practices*: And indeed much more the latter, becauſe if we take care of that, our Errours of the former kinde, whether they be with us, or with you, or with both, will I hope be graciouſly pardoned, by him who ſometimes accepteth the Will for the Deed, and always valueth Sincerity above Knowledge.

SECT. 6.

I proceed to conſider the Second Conſequence, which the Doctor chargeth upon our Opinion; He expreſſeth it thus: *If the Will can man make* P. 262. *uſe of that Grace for Converſion, which it can refuſe; or if there be no more Grace wrought in us, but what may be refuſed (i. e.* received in vain, and Converſion may not follow;) *then it is abſolutely uncer-*

uncertain, notwithſtanding the purpoſe of God, and the purchaſe of Chriſt, whether ever any one in the World ſhould be Converted unto God or no.

Before I Anſwer this Objection, it will not be amiſs to make it a little eaſier to be underſtood, and then I think it will be no hard matter to Anſwer it.

1. When we ſay any *thing is uncertain*, the meaning is, that *we are not certain of it*; the uncertainty is in our ſelves, not in the Propoſition, which we know muſt be true or falſe, though we know not whether: But whereas he makes Uncertainty in the Caſe by him mentioned, to be *Abſolute*; I know not what he could intend by adding that word, but to expreſs his own vehemence: For *conditional* Uncertainty ſeems to be, when I am uncertain of one thing, becauſe I am uncertain of another, without the knowledge of which, that cannot be known; but I am equally uncertain of both. Setting therefore that inſignificant word aſide, I think the meaning muſt be either, that no man is certain that any one will prove a true Convert at laſt, or that God was not certain of it, or neither man nor God. But

2. There is another thing which the man probably intends, though 'tis not the meaning of his words; and that is, that in the *Nature of the thing, it was poſſible that no man ſhould Convert.*

I ſhall firſt try to anſwer him according to the meaning of his words; and Firſt, that upon our Prin-

Principles, *a man* cannot be certain that any one would in the event be a Convert. Now if this be a true Consequence, it would be as true, that neither can a man be certain upon our Principles, that any one would at last be found *Unconverted.* And if the Doctor imagines that the *former* uncertainty would be apt to do us harm; when he tells us what it is, I think it will be easie to shew him, that 'tis sufficiently repaired by the *latter.* But, *according to us,* a man cannot be certain of the former, *notwithstanding the purpose of God and the purchase of Christ*; *i. e.* notwithstanding God's Decree to convert some men by an irresistible Operation upon their mindes, and *Christs* undertaking for them in particular, to satisfie the Justice of God in their behalf. Now I think the Dr. argues in this manner: If we believe that all the Grace which God affords towards our conversion may be received in vain, it follows that we cannot be certain of the conversion of one man in the event; and if we cannot be certain of that, then we must deny the Doctrine of personal Election, and particular Redemption, as he understands it. And if this be the worst consequence from our Principles concerning Grace, that we must reject his leading Error, I think we need not for this reason be ashamed to own them.

But I desire it may be observed, that how strong soever this Objection may seem to be, yet it cannot reasonably be laid against one part of our perswasion, *viz.* that *the Will can make use of that Grace which it can refuse*, as the Doctor expresseth it. For though it be granted that God gives to all that power by which they may convert, and

nd ſave themſelves, and conſequently that the *unconverted refuſe that Grace which they can uſe*; yet it does not at all follow, that therefore we muſt be uncertain whether any ſhould ever convert or not. The reaſon is, becauſe we might yet believe that God does more for *ſome* than he does for *all*: So that this Objection is quite avoided in Dr. *More*'s way of ſtating theſe things, viz. that *there is a diſcriminative Grace, by vertue whereof ſome few of Mankinde will be irreſiſtibly ſaved; but that the reſt of the world are Probationers, that is, have Free-will, and are in a capacity of being ſaved, ſome greater, ſome leſs; and that whoſoever is damned, it is long of himſelf. And farther, that touching all the reſt of Mankinde, there is Grace ſufficient offered to them ſome way or other, ſome time or other; and that ſeveral of them, according to their faithfulneſs to that light and power which God has given them, ſhall be actually ſaved.* Now it is this part of our perſwaſion, *viz.* that man may be converted by Grace that does not produce the effect by irreſiſtible force; and that ſuch Grace is offered to all, which we are moſt concerned for. For we conceive this *Hypotheſis* neceſſary to make ſence of our Preaching, to vindicate the ſincerity of the Scriptures, and to clear the righteouſneſs of God. As for the other part, that God has no where promiſed to convert any man by an immediate irreſiſtible Operation, nor any where ſaid that he does ſo; if it be denied, and it be pretended on the other ſide, that ſome few are converted in that manner, we do not repine at it, as that learned perſon with good reaſon ſays *we ought not*. But I muſt take leave to ſay, it is an *Hypotheſis* as hard to prove as to confute; for whether it is ſo or not ſo, depended

Myſtery of Godlineſs, P. 502.

pended upon the mere pleasure of God, and he has not revealed his will to us in this matter one way or other. Nor do I think we must be forced to grant it, for the avoiding of this Objection.

For, though I suppose the conversion of every man to depend upon his own choice, as well as upon the Operations of the Holy Ghost; and although the perswasion of it self could not make me certain that some would be found Converts at last; yet there are divers other reasons consistent with this Supposition, that make me certain of it. I shall name but this at present, that I know many have been converted, and died in the Lord, and *through Faith and Patience inherit the Promises*. And by divers predictions in Holy Writ, I know many more will be faithful unto the Death; and that when Christ shall come to Judgement, there will be some who shall be *changed*, and put on Immortality. So long as I may be certain of what is past, and that those things will come to pass which God hath foretold, I may also be certain that Gods Grace hath, and will prevail in multitudes of men, before the end of all things. Therefore *a man* may be certain of it, though he should not believe that any were converted by a cause that rendred the contrary impossible. Therefore

Secondly, if Dr. *Owen* means, that upon our Principles, it was uncertain to *God* whether any would convert or not, he is under a great mistake; for it is none of our Principles that God cannot foresee a contingent event. On the other hand we believe, induced thereunto by Rea-

Reaſon and Scripture, that all events are known to God, even thoſe which depend upon the Free-will of man; and therefore that he knew that ſome would be converted, and who they were, although their converſion was to be a free act of their own. And this, I think, is a ſufficient Anſwer to the Doctor's Objection, according to the meaning of his words.

But 2. If his intent be, that upon our Principles it *was poſſible in the nature of the thing* that none ſhould ever convert, then I grant the Conſequence to be good; but I know of no harm that will come by owning it. It is no imputation upon the wiſdom of Governours in enacting wholeſome Laws for the good of their Subjects, and in providing for the obedience of thoſe Laws by Rewards and Puniſhments, and all reaſonable Inducements; that when they have done all, it is barely poſſible that no one perſon within their Dominions will be retained within his duty. Now clear it is, that this in the nature of the thing is poſſible, becauſe men have Free-will, and may do evil under the ſtrongeſt moral obligations to do well. But ſhould the World therefore be left without Law or Rule, and muſt Mankinde be governed by irreſiſtible force, or not at all? Nay, on the other hand, that freedom which includes a bare poſſibility that all may diſobey, proves the Wiſdom and Juſtice of Governing Mankinde by Laws and moral Inducements to obedience: But if we ſuppoſe men to be under a natural Neceſſity either of doing what is required, or of doing the contrary, it is very hard to underſtand how governing them by moral means ſhould be *wiſe* in the former caſe, or *juſt* in the latter. And ſo much for your Conſe-

CHAP.

CHAP. V.

Concerning ſome Teſtimonies of Scripture produced in this Controverſie; and of Praying for Grace.

SECT. I.

THE direct Arguments by which Dr. *O.* pretends to prove his Opinion, are moſtly formed either out of thoſe places of Scripture, wherein as he thinks the manner of being Converted, is expreſſed in Terms that ſignifie a *Phyſical* Operation; or thoſe wherein God is ſaid *to give Faith and Repentance*, and the like.

Of the firſt ſort of Texts, one is that of Epheſ. 1. 19, 20. *That you may know what is the exceeding greatneſs of his Power towards us who believe, according to the working of his mighty Power which he wrought in Chriſt, when he raiſed him from the Dead.* His Argument from this place is this: The Power by which God raiſed *Chriſt* from the dead, was *Phyſical* and Almighty; Therefore it is the ſame Power by which he *makes men Believers.* To which I might Anſwer, that as this Concluſion may be underſtood, the Doctor does not conclude what we deny; for if the Apoſtle meant that the ſame Power which raiſed *Chriſt* from the dead, is the Cauſe of our Faith, his meaning alſo might be, that the power of God in the Reſurrection of *Chriſt*, was a Teſtimony inducing

p. 269.

ducing us to believe; and in this ſence he makes us Believers, by that Power wherewith he raiſed *Chriſt* from the Dead. But the meaning of the Doctor in that Concluſion is this: That God worketh Faith in the Mindes of men by an Immediate Act of the ſame power, wherewith he raiſed *Chriſt*. But this can by no means be proved from the Text; for the Apoſtle does nowhere ſpeak of the exceeding greatneſs of Gods power under the Notion of a Cauſe why they believed, but of the Greatneſs of his power towards thoſe who believed already. And the meaning ſeems to be either, 1. That the exceeding greatneſs of his Power was that, whereby he ſtill continued to give teſtimony to the truth, anſwerably to that great Teſtimony of the Reſurrection of Chriſt: For according as God did once witneſs the Truth by that Effect of his Omnipotence, ſo he did ſtill confirm it by the exceeding greatneſs of his Power; which was ſaid to be *towards them that believed*, becauſe God endued them with extraordinary Gifts, and wrought Miracles by them, according to that Promiſe of Chriſt to his Apoſtles; *Ye ſhall receive power, after that the Holy Ghoſt is come upon you*, Acts 1. 8. and to other Believers of thoſe days. *Theſe ſigns ſhall follow them that believe: In my Name they ſhall caſt out Devils*, &c. Mark 16. 17. *He that believeth on me, the works that I do, he ſhall do alſo*, Joh. 14. 12. Now the Apoſtle prayed, that they might know what was the exceeding greatneſs of this Power, *i. e.* that they might ſtill be more plentifully endued with Miraculous Gifts; and this ſence is made probable by the 17th verſe, where he prayeth for ſome of thoſe Gifts particularly in their behalf, *viz.* that

God

God would give them the Spirit of Wisdome and Revelation. Or, 2. By the exceeding greatness of Power may be meant that, wherewith God would raise them at the last day, according as he had already raised *Christ*, the *first fruits* of them that sleep. The Resurrection of *Christ* is frequently mentioned together with the resurrection of Believers, and is used as the great Argument to support our Faith and Hope. Thus saith the Apostle, *If the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, he that raised up Christ from the dead, shall also quicken your mortal bodies, by his Spirit that dwelleth in you*, Rom. 8. 11. This sence seemeth to be countenanced by the 18th *vers.* where he prayeth that they might *know what is the hope of his calling, and what the riches of the Glory of his Inheritance in the Saints.* For as the Glory of the Inheritance, which follows the Resurrection, answereth *Christs being set at Gods right hand in the heavenly places, far above all Principality and Power*, &c. vers. 20, 21. so *the hope of his calling*, the *lively hope* to which we are *begotten*, of being raised to Blessedness, answereth *Christs* being raised from the dead, *vers.* 20. If this be the sence, then the Apostle prayeth that they might be more and more illuminated with the knowledge of the grounds of their Faith, and of the great Rewards which they lived in the Hopes of. Which of these meanings is to be prefer'd, I will not say; It were no hard matter to shew, that both of 'em might be intended, *viz.* that the Apostle prayed for their encrease in the knowledge of God's Power towards them, both here in this Life, and hereafter at the Resurrection. But however, this Text speaks not one word of the manner whereby God worketh Faith

Faith in men, after he has afforded them the grounds and means of believing; nor doth the Context lead to any ſuch meaning: It ſpeaks of that which is nothing to the Doctor's purpoſe, *viz.* the great Power of God towards thoſe that believed already, whether that whereby the Truth was confirm'd, or that whereby they themſelves ſhould be rais'd from the Dead.

Another place produced by him to this purpoſe is that of 2 Cor. 4. 6. *God who commanded the Light to ſhine out of Darkneſs, hath ſhined in* P. 283. *our Hearts, to give the light of the knowledge of the Glory of God in the face of Jeſus Chriſt.* His Argument from hence is this: It was by a *Phyſical* Omnipotent Act that God created Light; therefore by ſuch an act he Illuminates us with the ſaving Knowledge of the Goſpel. To which I anſwer, That it is not here ſaid, nor can it from hence be proved, that God enlightens our Mindes the ſame way by which he enlightned the world. The Doctor himſelf confeſſeth thoſe expreſſions of *ſhining into our hearts*, and *giving the light of knowledge*, to be *Metaphorical*: Only he cannot ſee the Alluſion between the *Metaphor* and the proper ſence, unleſs we ſuppoſe the *knowledge* to be as properly *created* as *Light* was. But this is ſomewhat ſtrange: For 1. there is a very obvious Similitude between Light and Knowledge, inaſmuch as by both we diſcern things as they are, and can diſtinguiſh and compare, and the like. 2. There may be this reaſon for the Alluſion, added to the other, that the benefits of this knowledge in their kinde, are as great as thoſe of God's commanding the Light to ſhine out of Darkneſs in theirs. 3. And this farther reaſon,

that the Almighty power of God was no leſs ſhewn in giving teſtimony to the Truth of *Jeſus*, than in making Light by the word of his Power. 4. And this I conceive to be the principal reaſon; that the Gentile world was in a ſtate of deplorable Ignorance, till God called them by his Goſpel; and therefore his bringing them to the knowledge of the Goſpel, was like commanding the Light to ſhine out of Darkneſs. Theſe are very likely reaſons for the Alluſion, which doubtleſs Dr. *Owen* might have ſeen as well as another, if he had not been too fond of his Concluſion, which he can prove no otherwiſe from the Text, than by pretending that no other reaſon can be given for the Alluſion.

The ſame Anſwer will ſerve for thoſe Arguments which he offers from thoſe Expreſſions of
P. 269. Gods *Creating*, *Quickning*, *Forming*, *Giving a New Heart*, &c. *viz.* that very good reaſon may be ſhewn why theſe Expreſſions are uſed, though not upon his Principles, as hath been abundantly manifeſted already. But he is very confident upon his Adverſaries when he falls into theſe Arguments, as he doth unreaſonably often. He ſaith in this place; *Where our Converſion is ſpoken of with reſpect to us, it is paſſively expreſſed*; *we are created in Chriſt Jeſus*, *we are new Creatures*, *we are Born again, and the like*; *which one Obſervation is ſufficient to evert the whole Hypotheſis of Arminian Grace.* I think this Obſervation *everts* our *Hypotheſis* no more than his miſcalling us *Arminians*; that is, not at all. For theſe Expreſſions do imply indeed, that we are *paſſive* in Converſion; but that we are *merely paſſive*, can be no more concluded from them, than from that expreſſion

preſſion of *making to our ſelves new Hearts*, it can be concluded that we are *merely active* in it. But ſays the Doctor in the ſame Chapter, *Where is it ſaid that a man is Born again or Begotten anew by himſelf?* No where, I think; but the reaſon of that ſeems to be this, that theſe Phraſes are moſt aptly uſed to note that aſſiſtance which is needful to Converſion; or as the Doctor ſays, to *denote an act of God, and not ours.* P. 285. *It is true*, ſaith he, *God doth command us to circumciſe our Hearts, and to make them new; but he doth therein declare our Duty, not our Power.* P. 286. And ſo he would have ſaid, if any ſuch expreſſion were to be found as that of *begetting our ſelves*, that this declares our Duty, not our Power. But if *circumciſing our Hearts*, and *making a new Heart and a new Spirit*, ſignifie the ſame effect with being *Created* and *Born again*; and if it be preſcribed to us as our duty under the former expreſſions, and this although thoſe very expreſſions imply alſo that we are not able to perform it of our ſelves; then it cannot be concluded from the latter Expreſſions that we are merely paſſive in Converting, or that Converſion is impoſſible without the Doctors Phyſical Irreſiſtible Act. So that upon the whole matter it is plain, that our own choice and action muſt concur with the Divine *Grace* towards Converſion; for otherwiſe how ſhall a man make ſence of our being commanded to do that which yet God hath promiſed to do for us? And I think, *this one Obſervation is ſufficient to evert the whole Hypotheſis of* your *Stoical* and *Phariſaical* Divinity.

But I have one other reaſon to offer, why from theſe Expreſſions it cannot be proved that God

converteth by this *Phyſical* act, and that is this, becauſe the converſion of ſinners is in the Scripture aſcribed to the Miniſters of the Goſpel, under the ſame Expreſſions. Thus ſaith St. *Paul*, In Chriſt Jeſus I *have begotten you* through the Goſpel, 1 *Cor.* 4. 15. And of himſelf he ſaith, that he was ſent to the Gentiles to *open their eyes*, and to *turn them from darkneſs to light*, and from the power of Satan to the living God, *Acts* 26. 18. If theſe Expreſſions do imply a *Phyſical irreſiſtible* act in Converſion, then St. *Paul* converted the Gentiles *Phyſically* and *irreſiſtibly*; which is more than the Doctor will ſay: That therefore God converts us in this manner, becauſe we are ſaid to be *born of him*, and to be *enlightened by him*, &c. is more than he ought to ſay.

There is another Argument of the Doctor's included in the former, which he makes a mighty
P. 272. ſtir withal, *viz.* that *the work of Converſion it ſelf is expreſly ſaid to be of God*; therefore he converteth by the *Phyſical* act. This is hardly worth Anſwering; for the ſame work is expreſly aſcribed to man, *Thou ſhalt ſave thy ſelf, and them that hear thee*, 1 Tim. 4. 16.

SECT. 2.

I proceed next to thoſe places where God is ſaid to *give* a new Heart, and Faith, and Repentance, &c. The principal whereof is that of *Ezek.* 36. 26. *A new heart alſo will I give you, and a new ſpirit will I put within you; and I will take away the ſtony heart out of your fleſh, and I will give*

you

you an heart of flesh, &c. Again, *I will give them an heart to know me*, Jer. 24. 7. The Doctor supposeth actual Conversion to be here promised, and that not conditionally, but absolutely: therefore, as he thinks, it must be performed by an irresistible Operation. In answer to this Argument, I deny that it is here absolutely promised, that those who are meant in the promise should be converted. I have proved in the First Part, *p.* 294, *&c.* that God is sometimes said in the Scripture to do those things for the effecting of which he hath contributed means and help sufficient; and to have done that which yet through our own fault is not done, nor hath its effect; *I have purged thee, and thou wast not purged.*

Here I shall adde, that he is likewise said to *give that* which yet we may not have through our own fault. Thus in the words of our Lord, we pray that God would *give* us our daily Bread; yet we must labour for it: he may give it therefore, and we through negligence miss it for all that. So *Joh.* 6. 32, 33, 34. our Saviour told the Jews, *My Father giveth you the true Bread from Heaven*; yet they received it not; for *they believed not*, v. 36. I do not say that these phrases never signifie the actual receiving of the benefit said to be given; for, as I shall shew afterward, sometimes they do: But because they do not always imply that sence, therefore we must not argue one way or other merely from the phrase, but finde out the sence by the circumstances of the place. Therefore whether these Promises are to be understood of God's granting abundant means towards newness of Heart and Life, must be gathered from the circumstances belong-

ing to them, and particularly from the Event. But from thence I proved also, that these places were so to be understood, *viz.* Because the Promises are universal, yet all were not, and are not Converted that were meant in the Promises, as I shewed from *Ezek.* 11. 19, 20, 21. p. 296, *&c.* And I further prove that the Promise in *Ezek.* 36. 26. *Of giving a new heart,* &c. is not absolute, from *vers.* 37. where to the foregoing Promises, whereof that is one, this Condition is added, *Thus saith the Lord God, I will yet for this be enquired of by the house of Israel, to do it for them.* From whence it is plain, that something was to be done on their parts, *viz.* what was proper for them, in order to the obtaining of the Promise.

P. 276. This being premised, it will be easie to answer the Doctor's Questions upon these places; *Doth God promise to Convert us, on condition we convert our selves; to work Faith in us, on condition that we believe; and a new heart, on condition that we make new hearts to our selves? To this are all the Adversaries of the Grace of God brought by those Conditions, which they feign of its efficacy, to preserve the Soveraignty of Freewil in Conversion.* Sovereignty of Freewil in Conversion there is none to be preserved; the subordinate use thereof in Conversion is that which all Christians, setting aside an antient Heretick, and a few late Opinionists, we assert. But to let pass your virulence, to your Questions I answer; That God promiseth in these and the like places, that Grace, by which we shall be abundantly enabled to Con-

Semper hoc Ecclesiæ Catholicæ Judicium fuit, cum Gratiâ, sed sub Gratia tamen conspirare amice arbitrii Libertatem, *Voss. Pel.* Hist. *p.* 1.

Convert, and by which we aſſuredly ſhall, if it be not our own fault: This is our ſence concerning the Condition implied, not as you ridiculouſly repreſent it, that God promiſeth to do All, on condition we do All our ſelves. But now if the Doctor would be pleaſed not to look always on one ſide of a thing, but to conſider thoſe expreſſions, on the other hand, in the very ſame Prophet (Chap. 18. verſ. 30, 31.) *Repent and turn your ſelves from all your Tranſgreſſions; make you a new heart and a new ſpirit:* I would fain know of him upon his Suppoſition, *That we are merely paſſive in Converſion, and that God does all*, what is the meaning of theſe Exhortations, and whether they do not look ridiculouſly, compar'd with an abſolute Promiſe, that God will do all himſelf. Is not this juſt like a Father's bidding his Child, that is fallen down and cannot riſe, to come to him, and he will help him up?

Again, *I enquire*, ſaith the Doctor, *whether God doth really effect and work in any, the things which he here promiſeth that he will work and effect? If he doth not, where is his Truth and Faithfulneſs?* I might anſwer this Queſtion with another; Whether God doth work theſe things in All; if not, where is his Truth? But he comes over with this again, and to ſtrengthen the Argument, he ſaith, *If God doth not work effectually, what he promiſeth, it muſt be either becauſe he cannot, or becauſe he will not: If the latter, this is to make him a Liar; if the former, where is the wiſdom of promiſing to work that in us, which he knew he could not effect without our compliance?* &c. Now it is here either weakly, or maliciouſly ſup- P. 276.

posed to be our Opinion, That God cannot effect our Conversion, without our compliance in order to it. But all this doth not prove, but suppose that Irresistible Grace is promised in these places. No doubt, but God if he will can Convert us in that manner; and when you have proved that he hath promised in these Texts so to do, then you may seasonably ask these Questions; but not till then.

Moreover, the Doctor produceth other places for the same purpose, where the word *giving* or *granting* is joyn'd to *Faith*, *Repentance*, or the like; though 'tis evident that the Phrase doth not signifie alike in all of them. It would make a man suspect that he fetcht his proofs from the Concordance, instead of the Bible; for you will see, he argues from the sound of words, and not from their sence, or from the scope of the place. Thus because God is said to give or grant Repentance, *Acts* 11. 18. therefore he *infallibly worketh* Repentance in all to whom he is said to give it. And yet 'tis as plain as can be, that *Giving Repentance* in that place, signifies only *communicating the Gospel*, which is the means of Repentance. For after St. *Peter* had related the story of *Cornelius*, to the Apostles and Brethren at *Hierusalem*, *they held their peace, and glorified God, saying, Then hath God also to the Gentiles granted Repentance unto Life.* Again, he urgeth that place, *To you it is given on the behalf of Christ, not only to believe on him, but to suffer for his sake*, Phil. 1. 29. Now this place doth not speak at all of the manner whereby God wrought Faith in them at first, or Patience then. The meaning of the words is plainly this, that it was an Honour

nour and a great Advantage to them, to ſuffer for Chriſt, as well as to believe in him. For which reaſon they ought *not to be terrified*, v. 28.

Sometimes indeed, the phraſe of *Gods giving repentance*, ſignifies the actual Repentance of thoſe to whom it is ſaid to be given; as in that place cited by the Doctor, *If peradventure God will give them repentance*, 2 Tim. 2. 15. *i. e.* if they will repent. But then, this does not prove that Repentance is given by a *Phyſical* act, which renders it impoſſible not to Repent; becauſe it is a ſufficient reaſon to aſcribe our Converſion to God, that we contribute nothing towards it in compariſon, though ſomething we muſt do, as the immediately following words plainly imply; *And that they may recover themſelves out of the ſnare of the Devil.*

That other place, *Deut.* 29. 4. produced by the Doctor, is to be interpreted in the ſame manner: *The Lord hath not given you an heart to perceive, and eyes to ſee, and ears to hear, unto this day*; i.e. you have not yet an Heart to perceive, *&c.* But it is plain from the Context, that the reaſon intended in this place, why they did not perceive, was not becauſe they wanted that Grace which would have rendred it impoſſible for them *not to perceive*; but becauſe of their own perverſeneſs, who might have perceived, and yet would not. For thus *Moſes* upbraids their obſtinacy; *Ye have ſeen all that the Lord did before your eyes in the Land of* Egypt *unto* Pharaoh, *and unto all his Servants, and unto all his Land, the great temptations which thine eyes have ſeen, the ſignes and thoſe great miracles*;

cles; *yet the Lord*, &c. *And I have led you forty years in the wilderneſs, and your Clothes are not waxen old*, &c. *i. e.* This is a marvelous thing, that the Lord hath given you all this cauſe to perceive, and to know him, to truſt in him, and to obey him, and yet that he hath not given you an heart to do this. Nothing ſeems plainer than that *Moſes* deſigned to expoſtulate with the *Iſraelites* about their unreaſonable Unbelief, and to lay before them the inexcuſableneſs of their murmuring and diſobedience. But now if by thoſe words, *God hath not given you an heart to perceive*, *Moſes* had intended to ſignifie to them that the Lord had not yet beſtowed upon them that Grace which was neceſſary to make them perceive, *viz.* that of the Doctor's *Phyſical* Operation; then inſtead of aggravating their diſobedience, which was his deſigne, he had made the moſt reaſonable Apologie for it that they could deſire: For if hitherto it had been always impoſſible for them to perceive, why ſhould their dulneſs be blamed? On the other hand, *Moſes* intended to ſhew them that it was not onely poſſible, but ſo much had been done to make them perceive, that it was a marvelous thing they did not. But is it ſuch a wonder for a man not to do that which was always impoſſible to be done by him? Nay, it is evident that the *Emphaſis* of the Expoſtulation lies in thoſe very words, *Yet the Lord hath not given thee an Heart to perceive.* Therefore certainly they do not contain any matter of reaſonable excuſe for them, but the principal matter of Accuſation, which can be no other than this: 1. That they did not perceive. 2. Notwithſtanding the Lord had done ſo much to make them perceive. So that the reaſon why the

the Event is thus expreſt, *The Lord hath not given thee an Heart*, &c. is becauſe this Expreſſion connotes their Perverſeneſs, together with what God had done to cure them of it: and was therefore very fitly choſen to expreſs their inexcuſableneſs.

This is all I ſhall ſay to thoſe Teſtimonies of Scripture which the Doctor produceth for his Opinion; for thoſe that I have not directly anſwered, are parallel to ſome that I have. It had been eaſie for any one to have anſwered his Arguments from them, by the help of thoſe Principles and Obſervations that had been made good before. But he repeats them ſo often, and with ſo much confidence, that I thought it needful to take this particular notice of them, leſt I ſhould ſeem to decline his beſt Arguments: But if theſe be his beſt, he has a bad Cauſe on't, or the Cauſe wants a good Champion. This Obſervation one may make of all theſe his citations of Scripture, that he never conſiders the Context, or the ſcope of the place, though the right underſtanding of the words manifeſtly requires it. But then indeed his Cauſe required that they ſhould not be rightly underſtood; and therefore when theſe men have a place of Scripture before them, and ſnatch a ſingle Sentence out of it, and ſometimes a bit of a Sentence, which diſjoyn'd from the reſt, ſounds as if it were for their turn; they do as well as their Cauſe will let them: For if the paſſage were produced with the light of the Context about it, one might eaſily perceive the true meaning of it, which would quite ſpoil their Argument from the ſound of the words. And I would aſſoon take the

next

next mans opinion that I meet in the Streets, concerning the ſence of Scripture, as their Interpretation of thoſe paſſages which they produce for the ſervice of their Cauſe.

SECT 3.

He has but one Argument more to prove that converſion is by a Phyſical and Almighty operation, and that is taken from the Prayers of the Church.

P. 256. *There was no Argument*, ſaith he, *that the Antients more preſſed the Pelagians withal, than that the Grace which they acknowledged did not anſwer the Prayers of the Church, or what we are taught in the Scripture to pray for. And there is not a Pelagian in the world who e're once prayed for Grace, or gracious Aſſiſtance againſt ſin and Temptation, with a ſence of his want of it, but that his Prayers contradicted his Profeſſion.* Very right; but this is nothing to us who are no *Pelagians*: But 'tis all one for that, he ſtrikes at us however, as if there were no ſence in our prayers for Grace, unleſs we acknowledged that Grace to be a Phyſical Irreſiſtible Operation; *i. e.* unleſs we prayed that God would abſolutely do all for us himſelf, and leave nothing for our endeavours.

The Church of God, ſaith he, *prayeth that God would convert us, and create a clean Heart, and renew a right Spirit in us; that he would give us Faith, and increaſe it in us.* But it follows no more that the Church prays God would do this by your *Phyſical* Act, than you have proved that thoſe Expreſſions imply ſuch an Act.

Nay,

Nay, but *do we only deſire that God ſhould ſo help and aſſiſt us*, as that it ſhould be yet poſſible for us to *refuſe his help?* I ask you alſo, whether you indeed deſire that God would convert you by an Irreſiſtible Act; Do you pray that you may be merely paſſive in the work of your Sanctification? To your Queſtion we Anſwer: We pray that God would help us, though I know, that if we adde not other endeavours to our Prayers, we *do refuſe his help.* Again, *For a man to lye praying with Importunity for that which is in his own power, and can never be effected but by his own power, is fond and ridiculous.* I Anſwer, But we pray for that Grace without which our Duty is not in our own Power, and for that Grace which we cannot obtain but by Prayer; and this is not Fond and Ridiculous. P. 276.

You do very well, in the general to be careful, that our *Perſwaſions* concerning the Grace of God ſhould be conſiſtent with our *Prayers.* I hope you will not think it unreaſonable to deſire likewiſe of you, that both our *perſwaſions* and our *Prayers*, may fairly conſiſt with the *Neceſſity of our own Endeavours*, to procure what God hath promiſed, and what we, encouraged by his Promiſe, ask of him in Prayer. If you will impartially conſider it, you will, I believe, finde that upon our Principles, one may eaſily make good ſenſe of 'em all; but not upon thoſe which you contend for. This you may poſſibly underſtand by the inſtance of another Gift of God, which it ſeems came not into your Minde, when you caſt out that malicious Saying, that *ſome* of us *are ſo far gone into* Pelagianiſm, *that you know not what*

we

P. 266. *we have to pray for, unleſs it be Riches, Wealth and Preferments, with thoſe things that depend thereon.* No, Doctor, we do not pray for theſe things; but whether God hath given us *Riches* or *Poverty*, or juſt that *Food that is convenient for us*, we ſtill pray that he would *give us our dayly bread.* This you know we pray for; you do not know that we pray for Riches and Preferments. But if you are not wronged by one of your own Party; when that Prayer of our Lord, wherein he hath taught us to ask day by day our daily bread, hath been uſed in Publick, you have bravely clapt on your Beaver. Now notwithſtanding your contempt of the Lord's Prayer, I ſhall preſume with all good Chriſtians, that we do well in ſaying, *Give us this day our dayly bread*; which is that inſtance in which, as I ſaid, you may perhaps more eaſily diſcern the Truth, than in that of Spiritual Graces. Now although we pray for our dayly bread, as a gift from God; yet it is prepared by the Induſtry of man; it is eaſily purchaſed by the Rich, it is either hardly earned, or received from charitable perſons, by the poor; or if it comes in by none of theſe, or the like ways, I doubt they may ſtarve for all their Prayers.

But now I come with your difficulty, *He knows not how to pray, who prays not that God would by*
P. 276. *his Immediate Power give him* this bread which he prays for; *that he would really, powerfully and effectually take away all hinderances*, &c. *and actually collate upon us, and give unto us* the bread *we ask, that we may aſſuredly have it*; and not leave it to our care at all, to procure it for our ſelves; or even to lift up our hands, and to put it into our mouths. For *they do but mock God, who pray unto*

unto him to do that for 'em, which they can do for themſelves: For a man to lie praying that God would give him that Bread *which 'tis in his power to get for himſelf, is it not fond and ridiculous?* If you can ſhew that it is not, I will alſo ſhew you that it is no abſurd thing to pray that God would *give us Repentance*, though when all is done, we muſt contribute towards the effect of his Grace, by our own choice and endeavour.

I ſuppoſe, in the former caſe you would ſay ſome ſuch thing as this, that whatever Humane means they are by which our daily Bread comes in to us, yet 'tis incomparably more a Gift of God, by whoſe Providence we enjoy it, than an attainment of our own; and therefore as the thanks are entirely due to him, after we have received it, ſo we may very reaſonably and with good ſence beg it of him as his Gift before. If this you would ſay; pray conſider whether the like ſort of Anſwer would not ſerve to remove your pretended difficulty of praying that God would give us thoſe ſpiritual Graces, which yet we muſt labour for, or go without them. For as we ſay, that we are not merely paſſive in being *Converted*, ſo you will, I believe, acknowledge that we are not merely paſſive in being *Fed:* and if yet we may very congruouſly pray for the latter, which I hope you will not deny; then I deſire to be informed why we may not as congruouſly pray for the former, upon the ſame Suppoſition. For my part, I think ſomething more congruouſly, and that for theſe two reaſons. 1. As we ought to be incomparably more careful in labouring for the meat that endureth to everlaſting Life, than for the meat that periſheth; ſo God

God hath done more and greater things for our obtaining the former, than the latter: In our Redemption his Grace hath been, and ſtill is, ſuperabundant; we have therefore greater reaſon to pray for Spiritual good things, *as his Gift*, than Temporal, though both muſt come in a way of induſtry. 2. God ſometimes gives many temporal Bleſſings, and thoſe in great abundance; not onely Bread, but Riches to men that do not pray. But the Graces of his Holy Spirit are not confer'd but upon the condition of Prayer. Therefore if we ſhould pray for our daily Bread, much more for Repentance and all Chriſtian Graces; though neither will be attained merely by Prayer, or although we are not merely paſſive in receiving the one or the other.

How inconſiſtent your perſwaſion concerning Grace is, with a reaſonable account why you pray for it, I have ſhewn you in the Firſt Part, *p.* 244. And here I have ſaid enough to ſhew that no man can think it hard to make our Principles in this matter agree with our Prayers, who can make praying for Grace to ſtand with the reaſonableneſs of other endeavours after it. And this is all I ſhall ſay to the laſt Argument.

CHAP.

CHAP. VI.

Concerning the Nature of Holineſs.

SECT. I.

I Should next proceed to conſider what the Doctor's Opinions are concerning *Growth in Grace.* But he has mixed his Diſcourſe upon this Subject, with an Explication of the *Nature of Holineſs*, concerning which he ſeems to me to be ſo dangerouſly miſtaken, that I think it may not be amiſs to ſay ſomething to it as briefly as I can. The Doctor beſt knows the reaſon of his own method; but it had been more methodical to have ſaid *what Holineſs* is, before any thing had been ſaid concerning the work of the Spirit in *preparing* us for it, or *enduing* us therewith; eſpecially if, as he pretends, the Nature of Holineſs be *abſtruſe, and myſterious, and indiſcernible to the eye of carnal Reaſon.* For this ſeems to be a good reaſon why it ſhould have been ſomewhat explained, before it had been made part of another Queſtion: But for my own eaſe, I was more willing to comply with his method in this place, becauſe I am not of his minde, when he makes Holineſs to be a Subject of *abſtruſe* ſpeculation. I doubt not that the *Pure in Heart* know the excellent advantages of Holineſs, better than the *Carnal Minde*, ſo continuing, can know them. Experience of things that are to be done, inſtru- P. 326.

 eteth

ɛteth and convinceth more effectually than dry Argument. And I believe no man can deſcribe the Joys of the Holy Ghoſt in that manner, that one who is *alienated from the Life of God* may thereby attain ſuch an underſtanding of them, as the Godly Man has by Senſe and Experience. But I do not think it hard to make the Carnal man underſtand *what Holineſs is:* The difficulty thereof does not lye in the knowledge, but in the practice of it. And I take it to be no ſmall Argument of the Doctor's Faculty, in making eaſie things hard to be underſtood, that he has rendred the Notion of Holineſs very *abſtruſe* and *myſterious*, as indeed it is, if all be true that he has ſaid about it.

Not but that he has now and then plainly enough told us what it is: And it is to me no inconſiderable Argument, that the Notion of it is one of the plaineſt Notions in the Goſpel, and that Chriſtians are generally agreed about it; that Dr. *O.* has ſometimes dropt very clear Deſcriptions of it, in that very Diſcourſe, where for above an hundred and ſeventy pages together, he has ſet himſelf (if I may judge of his intention by his performance) to make it as hard to be underſtood, as he could for his life.

P. 335. He ſaies, That *to be cleanſed from all the defilements of ſin whatever they be, to have an heart inclined, diſpoſed, enabled to fear the Lord always, and to walk in all his ways and ſtatutes accordingly; with an Internal Habitual Conformity of the whole Soul unto the Law of God, is to be ſanctified or made Holy.* And this is well ſaid. But he that believes

believes this to be *Holineſs*, ſhould have a care of ſaying, that 'tis *Abſtruſe* and *Myſterious*; For there is nothing in this account of it, which a man of ordinary parts may not eaſily underſtand. For inſtance;

1. He might collect from this deſcription, that the Doctor by Holineſs does not mean a *bare relation*, whereby thoſe Things or Perſons are ſaid to be Holy, which are devoted to ſome Religious uſe, and in which ſence *All* Chriſtians are *Holy*; but ſome *Qualties* and *Actions* proper to reaſonable Creatures, in which ſence one that is Holy, by external relation to God, may be Unholy, as wanting thoſe Qualifications, by which he might anſwer his Pretence or Obligation.

2. This Deſcription contains the two General Heads of thoſe Qualifications wherein Holineſs conſiſteth; one whereof is, *to walk in all the Ways and Statutes of God*, in our Converſation and Practice to be Obedient to all his Laws: The other, *to be in heart inclined, diſpoſed, and enabled hereunto*; to obey him with that Forwardneſs, Heartineſs, and Sincerity, which ſheweth to God a temper of Minde, anſwerable to that appearance, which our outward practice maketh to man.

3. One may alſo judge by this deſcription, that ſuch Heartineſs and Sincerity conſiſteth in the *Fear of the Lord*, in Reverence to his Authority, and awful reſpect to his Juſtice; and in general, that it ſuppoſeth the Principles and Reaſons of Obedience to be ſuch, as are implied in the belief of God's Attributes. And whereas

the Doctor addes, *With an Habitual conformity of the whole Soul unto the Law of God*; I think this is eaſie to be underſtood. For the Law of God preſcribeth two ſorts of things. 1. Such as are Duties in their own *Nature*. 2. Such as are *made* Duties by his *Arbitrary* Command; in preſcribing which, his *Wiſdom* and *Goodneſs* is yet plainly diſcernible, ſince they tend to excellent purpoſes, and are of moſt profitable uſe. Now if we obey the Law of God preſcribing *Duties* of both kinds, *with an habitual Conformity of our Souls to them*: Then 1. we perform the former from an inward ſenſe of their Natural and Immutable Goodneſs, and of the eternal Indecency and Unrighteouſneſs of the contrary. And our Souls are truely conformable to thoſe Laws of God, which we obey *for that very reaſon, upon which he preſcribed them to us*. And 2. we perform the later, becauſe there is an inviolable Obligation laid upon us from the Authority, and Wiſdom, and Goodneſs of God, to perform them. And our Souls are as conformable to thoſe Laws of God, which depend upon his Soveraign Pleaſure, as they can be, when we obey them readily and chearfully, becauſe it *was his pleaſure* to preſcribe them to us, and with reſpect to *thoſe good Ends* for which he preſcribed them. But this diſtinction is not ſo to be underſtood, as if that which is the reaſon of our Obedience to the Divine Laws of one ſort, were not alſo a reaſon for obeying the other. For on the one hand, thoſe Duties which are to be performed by a reaſonable Creature, becauſe they are *in themſelves* indiſpenſably neceſſary; are likewiſe to be done, becauſe God hath moreover required them by expreſs Revelation of his Will: On the other hand,

hand, thoſe which are made neceſſary by God's poſitive Commands, are to be performed for this Reaſon, becauſe it is in its own Nature moſt Fit and Juſt, that a reaſonable Creature ſhould in *all things* be governed by the Infinite Wiſdom and Goodneſs of his Maker. Therefore if the reaſon of our Obedience to every Law of God, be a mixture of both theſe Principles, then *our whole Soul*, as the Doctor ſpeaks, *is conformable* to God's Law; For a more perfect kinde of Conformity than this, cannot be ſhewn. Finally, if our Obedience in practice be univerſal; and if we are led to every inſtance of it, incomparably more by theſe Principles, than by any other Conſiderations; then is this Conformity Habitual, ever preſent and ready for uſe, which is that I ſuppoſe, the Doctor underſtands by *Habitual* in this place.

4. When in part he deſcribeth Holineſs, by being *cleanſed from the defilements of Sin, whatever they be*; *i. e.* whether they be the defilements of outward evil Practice, in oppoſition to *Walking in all the Ways and Statutes of the Lord*, or the Defilements of Inſincerity and Impiety in the Heart, in oppoſition to an *Habitual Conformity of the Soul to the Law of God*; he does hereby not obſcurely intimate, that he meaneth ſuch Conformity of heart and life to the Divine Laws, as we who are fallen and degenerate Creatures, are capable of, and which will be available for us, through the Grace and Mercy of God, and the Merits of *Chriſt Jeſus*; That is, that it doth not conſiſt in never having tranſgreſſed, but in returning from ſin to God, according to that Exhortation of St. *Paul*, *Let us cleanſe our ſelves*

from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit, perfecting holiness in the fear of God, 2 Cor. 7. 1. Not in sinless perfection, but in sincerity and integrity of obedience, and in repenting where we fail; and *confessing our sins*, even while *we walk in the Light*; and then *the blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth us from all sin*, 1 Joh. 1. 7.

Now let us lay all these things together. If God hath shewn us what is Good, and what he requireth of us, and if his Laws are therefore sufficiently plain and intelligible; If it be easie to conceive that these Laws are to be observed; If it be no mysterious Doctrine, that the disposition of the Minde ought to be agreeable to such practice; If there be no obscurity in saying that the Consideration of the *immutable* goodness of most of God's Laws, and the *goodness* of the rest, and of the Authority and Justice of the great Lawgiver, should be the reason of our obedience, and prevail with us more than any other Considerations whatsoever. Finally, if it be very intelligible that one may believe and obey, who was once disobedient, and that he may be sincere in his obedience, who is not without all failing, that he may diligently perform his duty, repenting where he falls short of it, asking the pardon of God, and trusting to his mercy, and the Sacrifice of *Christ*'s death for the same. If, I say, there be no *abstruseness* in all this, then is the work of Holiness no abstruse and mysterious thing in the notion of it; because it consisteth in these plain things; that is, because *to be cleansed from the defilements of sin whatever they be, to have an Heart enclined, disposed, and enabled to fear the Lord always, and to walk in his ways and statutes accordingly*,

dingly, with an habitual conformity of the whole Soul to the Law of God; becauſe this, I ſay, *is to be ſanctified or made holy*; according to the Doctor's own confeſſion, and as in truth it is.

But notwithſtanding this and other good deſcriptions of the nature of Holineſs, which he has thruſt here and there into his Diſcourſe, he has yet upon the whole matter repreſented it to be a very *abſtruſe, myſterious*, and, to ſay the truth, an unintelligible thing. It were but a poor task to expoſe a man merely for talking in the dark; but he has ſaid ſome things concerning the Nature of Holineſs, which are not onely falſe, and inconſiſtent with what he has ſaid well concerning it, but moreover tend to betray the comfort of good men; and, which is worſe, to hinder the Repentance of the wicked.

This will appear, by conſidering how he has corrupted the notion of Holineſs, *viz.* 1. By denying that to belong to the Nature of Holineſs, which indeed does belong to it. 2. By adding that to the Nature of Holineſs, which does not belong to it.

SECT. 2.

1. He denies that to belong to the Nature of Holineſs, which does indeed belong to it; and that is *Moral Virtue*. He ſaith that Holineſs *differeth eſſentially from all moral Habits of our mindes, however acquired or improved*. And he will not allow *Moral Duties, whatſoever they be, to be any part of Goſpel-Obedience*. I have been in ſu-

P. 458.

P. 442.

ſpence, whether this palpable falſhood needed a confutation or not; for ſometimes the Doctor puts in a ſaying that quite overthrows this Opinion; and that, poſſibly, that he might have ſome colour to pretend that he is injured, if he were challenged for it. But ſince 'tis his plain deſigne through a very long and tedious part of his Book, to expoſe his Adverſaries for pretending that *at leaſt the main parts, if not the whole, of Religion, conſiſts in moral Virtue*; I concluded at length, that for the Truths ſake and our own, ſomething was needful to be ſaid upon this Subject.

And firſt I ſhall ſhew what we mean by *Moral Virtue*. The Doctor thought it convenient to make this as hard to be underſtood, as he pretended *Holineſs* was before. He will not allow that his Adverſaries ever ſpake *Intelligibly* about it;
P. 462. and he ſays it is *better expreſt by the Quakers, than by ſome new Patrons of it amongſt us*: But he neither tells us what the *Quakers* ſay about it, nor what he himſelf takes it to be, in oppoſition to us or them: ſo that he has caſt a double miſt before his Readers eyes, who if they neither can underſtand what he means by *Holineſs*, nor what we mean by *moral Virtue*, will be loath to deny they are ſeveral things, though they ſhould not be able to ſay which is which. As for his Ad-
P. 460. verſaries, he pretends that 'tis uncertain what they intend by either; but as to the latter, that
P. 462. they *ſeem to underſtand no more but outward Acts of Honeſty by it*, though they *do not practiſe ſo much*. Again, he takes it to be *a withered Carcaſs of Virtue* which we mean; *every way inferiour, as inter-*
P. 326. *preted by our practice, to the Righteouſneſs of Heathens.*

thens. Has not Mr. *H.* great reaſon to *love* this man *for his charity, and to be pleaſed with him for his candor?* But by the Doctor's leave, if our practiſe of moral Virtue be ſo ſcanty as he ſays it is, 'tis yet almoſt as broad as his deſcription of it, where he ſays, that *a moral courſe of Life, is properly ſo called, in oppoſition to open debaucheries and unrighteouſneſs:* But then we muſt confeſs withal, that it falls exceeding ſhort of our own notion of moral Virtue, or indeed of *Socrates*'s, *Plato*'s, *Ariſtotle*'s, *Plutarch*'s, or of any other Heathen Moraliſt, that has written well concerning Manners. The Doctor will have moral Virtue to be nothing elſe but the decency of outward Behaviour: but I challenge him to ſhew any good writer, Chriſtian or Heathen, that ever gave this account of it. He indeed and his Brethren have learnt of one another to deſpiſe *Morality*, and led their followers to it by corrupting the Notion, and making them believe, that to be a Moral man was no more than not to be a Drunkard, a *Railer*, a Pickpurſe, and the like; which indeed is no very great attainment. But till theſe men aroſe, it was never coopt up within ſo narrow a compaſs, as the Doctor knows, unleſs he has forgotten the *accompliſhments* of his younger *years*, as Mr. *H.* calls them: For I will venture to take any *Syſteme* of *Ethicks* that comes firſt to hand, and not doubt to ſhew by it that Moral Virtue is another kinde of thing than he takes it for. And indeed there is no one thing in the Notion whereof, men have been more generally agreed, than Moral Virtue. What variety ſoever there is in their expreſſions of it, they all concur in this ſence: That it is a prevailing Inclination of the Minde to thoſe manners, or that way

Diſq. p. 109.

P. 185.

Diſq. p. 2.

way of life, which is beſt for a reaſonable Creature. So that it comprehends a great deal more than *outward Acts of Honeſty and Temperance*, even the performance of All that ought to be done by us with Sincerity and Heartineſs in the ſame. In a word, by Moral Virtue, Wiſemen have hitherto underſtood, An univerſal goodneſs of Manners in Minde and Practice. If the Doctor thinks the Name is too ſhort for the Thing, there is much Authority and *ſome Reaſon* againſt him.

For 1. It is called *Virtue*, becauſe the proper *ſtrength*, *force* and vigour of a reaſonable Creature conſiſteth in this Goodneſs; that is, in a Temper of Minde and courſe of Life agreeable to right Reaſon. We do then exert that *Fortitude* which is proper to the excellency of our Nature, when the Man governs the Beaſt; *i. e.* when Luſt and all bodily Paſſion is ſubdued to the Law of our Minde. 2. It ſeems to be called Moral, becauſe it is converſant about the Manners, that is, the cuſtomary Diſpoſitions, and Actions of reaſonable Creatures as ſuch. In this ſence the Doctor himſelf
P. 387. uſes the word, when he oppoſes it to *Corporeal* or *Phyſical*. Thoſe Laws that are given with rational Inducements to Obedience, are ſaid to be *moral Laws*, as being proper and ſuitable to the Nature of Reaſonable Creatures, to whom they are preſcribed; and this in oppoſition to the Laws of Motion and Matter, by which God governs the reſt of his Works. And then why may not our Obedience to thoſe Laws be called *Moral* Virtue? There is another uſe of this word *Mo-*
P. 460. *ral*, acknowledged likewiſe by the Doctor himſelf, when he oppoſeth it to *Poſitive*. And in this ſence thoſe Laws only are ſaid to be *Moral*, which

which are of natural and perpetual obligation: Of which ſort are theſe, that God is to be believed in all he ſaies, and to be obeyed in all that he requires; that we are to do unto all men, as we would be done unto; that the greater good is to be prefer'd before the leſs; and an eternal Happineſs to come, far above the pleaſures of this world, and our preſent Life it ſelf. Now if theſe and the like ſtanding Rules, by which the Virtue of men is meaſured, and to which all weldoing may be reduced, are generally called *Moral* Laws; then I think our Conformity to them, may as unreprovably be called *Moral* Virtue.

I ſhall only adde, that Moral Virtue, which in general we take to be the Conformity of our Minds and Actions to the Rules of right Reaſon, is diverſified into kinds, by thoſe ſeveral Rules which are the meaſures of it. Thus there are divers Moral Virtues, *viz. Juſtice*, and *Patience*, and *Temperance*, and the like: For it is one Rule of Manners, That we ſhould give to every one his own; another, That we ſhould ſuffer any bodily Pain, rather than commit Evil; and a third, That we ſhould prefer the pleaſures of a good Conſcience, above all bodily delights whatſoever. And thus from other diſtinct Rules in Morality, there ariſe other Virtues, which are all included in the general Notion of *Moral Virtue*. Thus much concerning the meaning and uſe of the words. Now

2. When we ſay that *Holineſs* doth *in part* conſiſt of Moral Virtue, we ſay no more than what the Doctor grants, *viz.* That *all the Duties* P. 461.

of

of Moral Virtue are required of us. Thus ſaying, we underſtand the word *Moral* in the ſecond ſence, and ſuppoſe that there are ſome Duties required of us by particular Revelation, which could never be known by mere natural Reaſon. When we ſay, that the *main of Religion* conſiſteth in *Moral* Virtue, as the Doctor chargeth us; we underſtand the word in the ſecond ſence here alſo, and our meaning is, that the performance of thoſe Duties, which are in their own nature indiſpenſable, is the moſt fundamental and the moſt excellent part of Religion, of primary obligation, and the end of all other Religious performances. And for this we have good reaſon, if we will take our Saviours judgment, who maketh the *great* Commandments to be theſe two, of *Loving the Lord our God with all our hearts; and our Neighbour as our ſelves.* But I much doubt whether any ſay, That the *whole* of Religion or Evangelical Holineſs conſiſts in Moral Virtue. For generally we oppoſe Moral Duties and Virtues, to thoſe that are merely of revealed Religion. But if there be any amongſt us that have ſpoken in that manner as the Doctor pretends; then I ſuppoſe they underſtand the word in the firſt ſence, not meaning by *Moral Virtue* the performance of thoſe things only, which are *Duties* in their *own Nature*; much leſs ſome *ſpecial* Inſtances of Virtue only; leaſt of all, *the outward Acts of Honeſty and Temperance*: But in general, the Conformity of our Mindes and Actions to the whole Rule of our Duty. And in this ſence *Holineſs* and *Virtue* are the ſame thing, ſo plainly the ſame, that it were a ſhame to go about to prove it, if ſome men had not taken the ſhame upon themſelves before, by denying it. It is ſo

plain

plain a caſe, that the Doctor with all his windings and turnings has not been able to avoid ſaying ſeveral things, from whence it may be evidently concluded. And I ſhall therefore go upon no other grounds for the proof of it, than thoſe which he himſelf hath laid for me.

3. Let theſe paſſages of his be obſerved in the firſt place: *Our Holineſs is our Obedience; and the formal Nature of Obedience ariſeth from its reſpect unto the Authority of the Command.* P. 337. Again, *The Word of God is the adequate Rule of all Holy Obedience.* 1. *Materially; All that is commanded in that word belongs to our Obedience, and nothing elſe doth ſo.* 2. *Formally; Whatever we do, we are to do it, becauſe 'tis commanded.* P. 411. He has much more to the ſame purpoſe. Now from hence the Doctor might have concluded, that the *Matter* and *Form* of *Holineſs* is the ſame with that of *Moral Virtue*, and therefore that they are the ſame thing.

1. As to the Matter of Holineſs, the Doctor ſaith, that it *conſiſts in our Actual Obedience unto God, according to the Tenour of the Covenant of Grace.* Ibid. Now the Duties required of us in the Covenant of Grace, are either *Moral* in the ſtricteſt ſence, and of unchangeable obligation, of which the Apoſtle ſpeaks, *Phil.* 4. 8. *Finally, Brethren, whatſoever things are True, whatſoever things are Honeſt, whatſoever things are Juſt, whatſoever things are Pure, whatſoever things are Lovely, whatſoever things are of good Report,* εἴ τις ἀρετὴ, καὶ εἴ τις ἔπαινος, *If there be any vertue, if there be any praiſe, think on theſe things*; that is, to *do* them, as you ſee in the following verſe. And thus far the

the matter of our Obedience is the ſame in Holineſs and in Moral Virtue: Or they are made Duties by the Arbitrary Inſtitution of God; and that the performance of theſe is a part of Moral Righteouſneſs, appears from that very reaſon of performing any duty, which the Doctor requires to Holineſs, *viz.* to do it becauſe God hath commanded us ſo to do: For to do theſe things with reſpect to the Authority of God, who hath required them of us, is as neceſſary to make the performance of them acts of Moral Virtue, as acts of Holineſs. And by the ſame reaſon that doing them in obedience to God renders our actions holy, it renders them alſo virtuous. For it is an eternal principle of Manners, that whatever God requires we ought to do. And ſetting this aſide, I would fain know of the Doctor how it ſhould come to be one branch of Holineſs, to do what we have no other obligation to do, but the poſitive Command of God, or upon what other ground he can make Diſobedience in theſe caſes to be Unholineſs. If a Father commands his Son to do what he has no reaſon to do beſides the Authority of his Father; and if the thing be but lawful, the Son's diſobedience is unrighteous or immoral. When God commanded *Abraham* to offer up his Son *Iſaac*, *Abraham*'s obedience made his Offering a Righteous and Holy Action. Wherefore

2. That in which the Doctor places the Formal nature of holy Obedience, *viz.* doing what God commands becauſe he commands it; this, I ſay, being a Principle in Morality, I do not ſee how he can avoid concluding, that Holineſs and

and Moral Virtue are in truth the ſame thing diverſly expreſt: For to do that which is good, and to do it well, is the ſum of both.

Farther, when he ſpeaks of Holineſs as it is an imitation of *God* and *Chriſt*, he ſaith, that it *repreſenteth unto God the glory of his own Image renewed in us*, and that *Chriſt is the exemplary cauſe of our Holineſs.* As to the former; it is plain that thoſe perfections in God which our Holineſs is an imitation of, are ſuch as theſe: His Juſtice, Faithfulneſs, and Truth; His Patience, Mercy, and Charity; His hatred of ſin, and his love of Righteouſneſs; all which are Moral Perfections: And therefore when in theſe things we are followers of God, our imitation of him does neceſſarily become Moral Virtue. Sometimes by the *Holineſs* of God we may underſtand his Peerleſs Majeſty, and all the infinite Perfections of his Nature; as when 'tis ſaid that he is *Glorious in Holineſs*, Exod. 15. 11. and *Worſhip the Lord, for the Lord our God is holy*, Pſal. 99. 9. But when his Holineſs is propounded to us as an Example, and a reaſon why we ſhould be *holy*; we cannot then underſtand by his Holineſs any other Perfections, but thoſe in which we are particularly required, and indeed, in which onely it is proper for us to aſpire to his likeneſs; *i. e.* in his moral Perfections. And thus we are to underſtand that place, *Be ye holy, for I am holy*, 1 *Pet.* 1. 16. and that, *Be ye therefore perfect, as your heavenly Father is perfect*, Matth. 5. 48. the perfection which our Saviour there means, being that of *Loving Enemies*, and doing good to the unthankful and unjuſt. As to the latter, concerning Holineſs being an imitation of *Chriſt*; he

P. 329.

P. 447.

P. 444. he ſaith that *thoſe Graces which are moſt effectual in working us unto a Conformity to him, are Meekneſs, Humility, Patience, Self-denial, contempt of the World, readineſs to paſs by Wrongs, to forgive Enemies, to love and do good to All:* Which *Graces* are all *moral* Virtues in the moſt proper ſence; and if the *moſt effectual* be ſuch, I ſuppoſe the Doctor will not grudg that name to thoſe that are *leſs effectual.*

Does he not ſuppoſe that all ſin is moral Un-
P. 387. cleanneſs? *The Uncleanneſs we treat of,* ſays he, *is not Phyſical or Corporeal, but Moral and Spiritual onely*; therefore all Holineſs is Moral Purity.

Do they not all ſay that the *Decalogue* is the Moral Law, and have not ſome of 'em without offence pretended to reduce all the Duties of Religion under the Ten Commandments? But as
P. 330. the Doctor confeſſeth, *the whole of man is to fear God and keep his Commandments*, and *Holineſs comprizeth the whole duty of man.* If therefore *Holineſs* conſiſteth in obedience to the *Moral* Law, why may we not without offence call it *Morality?* I will proceed no farther in the proof of ſo plain a matter, but now briefly anſwer his Objections.

1. He ſaith, that *habits of moral Virtue, though they may incline, and diſpoſe the Will unto ſuch acts of Virtue as are materially the duties of Obedience, yet they do it not with reſpect to the glory*
P. 441. *of God in Jeſus Chriſt.* Again; *Moral habits may eneline the Will to works that for the Subſtance are duties, and are capable of having a particular good end,*

end, as giving alms to the Poor, to relieve and cheriſh them; but a want of reſpect unto the general end, allows them not to be any part of Goſpel-Obedience. It ſeems then that the Doctor grants there are *moral Habits*, and then Morality is more than outward acts of Honeſty. But this by the way. To the Objection,

I anſwer, That if it be one part of Moral Virtue to propound thoſe good ends to our ſelves in doing what is good, which we ought to aim at, then this Argument comes to nothing. Piety, which is a kinde of Juſtice towards our Maker, is it ſelf a *moral* Virtue; therefore to glorifie God, or to do all to his Glory, is the ſame. To *glorifie God in Jeſus Chriſt*, is an end of Obedience, which *Nature* teacheth not; but being made known by *Grace*, we are obliged to regard this end by the principles of Morality. As to his Inſtance of Almſ-giving; *relieving the neceſſitous* is one good end, by his own confeſſion. I will adde, that this is the *ſpecial goodneſs* of that duty, as it is diſtinct from others; and in the performance of any duty, whoſoever does good becauſe it is good, does it for the moſt excellent reaſon; for this is to do good as God does it. And I know not what reaſon the Doctor has to put the caſe of a Chriſtian that does good works, becauſe they are good, without regarding the *Glory of God in Jeſus Chriſt*; for this end hath its goodneſs too, and they lead one to the other. Becauſe the work is good, therefore 'tis for the Glory of God in *Chriſt*; and it is good that I ſhould glorifie God, and walk worthy of the Goſpel of his Son. He that does not conſider this, is wanting in gratitude, which is a Moral

Virtue. But I ſee no need of being afraid, leſt a Chriſtian who is careful in all his doings to do that which is good, ſhould want this conſideration; though if he ſhould want it, he would fall as much ſhort of Virtue as of Holineſs.

P. 325, 335, 336. 2. He ſays that Holineſs is wrought in us by *the eſpecial Grace of God*, whereas *Moral Virtue* is a thing in our own power, and therefore is not of the nature of Holineſs. To which it is ſufficient to anſwer, that *Moral Virtue* is not in our own power, but by the Grace of God. And he ſeems to think ſo himſelf in another place, where he accuſeth us *for ſuppoſing that we can practiſe Moral Virtue in our own ſtrength:* But we *ſuppoſe* no ſuch matter, but the contrary, becauſe we ſuppoſe that Moral Virtue, according to a very allowable uſe of the phraſe, is but another name for Holineſs, which we *cannot practiſe in our own ſtrength.*

P. 421.

P. 444, 450. 3. *Nothing*, as he argues, *belongs to Holineſs, but what in the actual communication of it is a peculiar fruit of Chriſts Interceſſion:* And, *the eſpecial procuring cauſe of Holineſs is the mediation of Chriſt, &c.* But Moral Virtue is not ſo procured, therefore it is not Holineſs, nor does belong to it. Now any one may ſee, that in this and the foregoing Argument, the Doctor does not argue from the nature of the things themſelves, which certainly is the beſt way, when one would ſhew that things are in their own nature different the one from the other; but from their *efficient* cauſes. I have ſhewn from the nature of the thing, that Moral Virtue is Holineſs; if therefore the Mediation of Chriſt, and the Operation of the Holy Spirit, are cauſes of Holineſs, as indeed they are, this doth not prove that Holineſs and Vir-

Virtue

tue are not the ſame thing; but that where-ever Virtue is, 'tis derived from Chriſt, and cauſed by the Spirit.

Laſtly, whereas the Doctor pretends that the Scripture does not once uſe this expreſſion of *Moral Virtue*; I *anſwer*, This proves not that the Terms do not properly expreſs that Holineſs which the Scripture requires: But I think thoſe words of St. *Paul*, εἴ τις ἀρετὴ, καὶ εἴ τις ἔπαινος, do ſufficiently warrant our uſe of the Phraſe. Now if the Doctor expreſſeth his indignation againſt us, for nothing but the uſe of a word which he does not like, when we mean the ſame thing with himſelf, (if by Holineſs he means an univerſal Obedience to God's Will, from ſuch principles and for ſuch ends as we have learnt from the Goſpel) this ſhews him to be an imperious and a contentious man. In ſhort, doth the Doctor allow of no Expreſſions but what are uſed in Scripture? if he does, this is a frivolous Exception; if he does not, let him ſhew where *Infuſed Habits*, and many ſuch Terms which he abounds with, are uſed in Scripture.

To conclude this matter, the keeping of God's Commandments is upon ſeveral accounts diverſly expreſt; it is principally in reſpect of that obligation ſo to do which ariſeth from the thing it ſelf, and which every mans Conſcience teſtifieth to him, that 'tis called *Righteouſneſs*; with regard to the goodneſs of God, which we thereby imitate, and that peculiar relation to him wherein we ſtand, 'tis called *Holineſs*: In conſideration of former diſobedience, a ſtate of *Repentance* and *Converſion*: With reſpect to the principal cauſe of it, *Grace*, and *Regeneration*; and

to name no more, becauſe the true perfection of Humane Nature conſiſteth in it, *Moral Virtue.* Now I think that thoſe Divines and Preachers, that expreſs *Univerſal Obedience* indifferently by all theſe Phraſes, as ſometimes by one, ſometimes by another, as their Argument leads them, take a better way to maintain the true Notion of it in the Mindes of men, than thoſe who reject any of them. Indeed, whoever ſhall read the Doctor's Invective againſt us, may gueſs, if he does not know us better, that we never exhort men to their Duty, under any other expreſſion of it, than that of *Moral Virtue*: But, if I have obſerved right, we uſe this expreſſion more ſparingly than any of the reſt. We uſe all the reſt, leſt our Hearers ſhould imagine that the Virtue of the better ſort of Heathens will ſerve the turn: We uſe this, leſt any of thoſe things meant by the Apoſtle, when he ſaid, *If there be any virtue, if there be any praiſe*, &c. ſhould be thought needleſs. And if we uſe it more frequently of late days, than heretofore, you ought to pardon us, who have made it in a manner neceſſary ſo to do, by that contempt and ſcorn which ſome of you, without reproof from the reſt, have thrown upon Moral Virtues, while you pretend to be zealous for Holineſs: Whereby, as we have reaſon to fear, it hath come to paſs, that ſome of your followers think they may be holy without them. We have this reaſon to fear it, that men are always willing to excuſe themſelves from that which is moſt difficult: And I think you will not deny, that the ſubduing of all Inordinate Paſſions, and the practice of thoſe Duties, which in their own Nature are Moral Virtues, is much more uneaſie to Fleſh and Blood, than Obedience

to

to mere poſitive Commands, and the external performances of Religion and Worſhip. Thus much for the firſt miſtake of Doctor *O.* in excluding that from the Nature of Holineſs, which does belong to it.

SECT. 3.

2. He does moreover *adde* ſomething to the *Nature of Holineſs* which does not belong to it, and that by pretending, 1. That Holineſs muſt be an *Infuſed* Habit. 2. That the perſon in whom the Habit is, muſt have been abſolutely Elected to Eternal Life.

1. That it muſt be an *infuſed* Habit. For he tells us, that Holineſs is *a Virtue, Power, Principle of Spiritual Life and Grace infuſed into the Soul, which is Antecedent unto, and the next Cauſe of all acts of true Holineſs.* In other good Habits, *the Acts do ſtill precede the Habits of the ſame nature and kinde* with the Acts. But Holineſs *is not acquired by any or many Acts of Obedience.* This is his Opinion, which he expreſſeth ſometimes plainly and roundly, ſometimes warily and deceitfully, as his manner is: And indeed a man of ordinary ſence would be willing to diſguiſe it a little, when he pretends to ſtand to it. For the bottom of it is this, That if one man ſhould by *Patience in weldoing*, gradually arrive to an habit of performing all thoſe things in Obedience to God's Command, which another does from an Habit (as he calls it) not acquired by exerciſe, but infuſed on a ſudden by the miraculous Power of God; the former is not holy, though the P. 416, 417.

later be ſo. If there be any need to confute this groſs miſtake, it may be done upon the Doctor's
P. 445. conceſſions in another place: *Nothing*, ſaies he, *belongeth unto Holineſs Materially, but what the Goſpel requireth; and nothing in us is ſo Formally, but what we do becauſe it is required.* Therefore where both theſe are, the true Nature of Holineſs is: For, to talk in his *ſubtile* way, the *Matter* and the *Form* conſtitute the Nature of a thing; and the Efficient Cauſe, as the Doctor learnt *forty years ſince*, muſt not go into the Definition of any thing; much leſs the manner in which that Cauſe operates: And yet he hath made both theſe to be part of the Nature of Holineſs, and ſo hath expoſed himſelf to be confuted by every Smatterer in *Logick*. Any one may be ſenſible of the folly of this pretence, by theſe Inſtances. The Apoſtles were by ſudden Inſpiration enabled to ſpeak divers Languages; but if another man ſhould by Study or Converſation attain the skill of ſpeaking the ſame; the Effect is plainly the ſame, though the Cauſes are different; the Skill is the ſame, though *infuſed* into the former, but *acquired* by the later. When our Saviour turned Water into Wine, he added nothing by the miraculous operation to the nature of Wine, which is ſtill the ſame, whether it be produced by a Miracle, or by Gods ordinary bleſſing of Natural Cauſes. In like manner, whether an Habit of Obedience be cauſed by the Operation of the Spirit, (as moſt certainly it is) or not; whether that Operation be *Inſtantaneous* or Gradual, *i. e.* whether the Habit be inſpir'd on the ſudden, (which the Doctor cannot prove that it is) or acquired by God's bleſſing and cooperating with our endeavours, the effect is ſtill the ſame,

same, which is a prevailing inclination to obey the whole Will of God, because it is his Will. Farther, the Doctor saith, *Our Holiness is our Obedience:* If therefore an infused Habit belongs to the nature of Holiness, then we are either *commanded* to infuse an habit, *i. e.* to work a Miracle, to do that which none but God can do; or rather we are commanded that God should infuse an habit into us. Such Nonsence as this must the Doctor maintain, if he will stand his ground.

But I must confess this is an admirable way to set Holiness and Virtue at the greatest distance from one another; for if the Doctor be sure that there is no other Holiness but what is irresistibly infused, and to the acquisition or *improvement* whereof (concerning which we shall see his opinion in the next Chapter) we do not in the least contribute by any care and endeavour of our own, but are purely passive in the whole business: Then I am sure there can be no virtue in it, no praise can belong to that which he calls Holiness, no more than to a piece of Wood or Stone for its being carved into a beautiful Form and Image by the irresistible hand and tools of the Artificer.

I think it was needful to expose this mistake of his, because it is of very dangerous consequence.

For 1. If it be believed that nothing is Holiness but what is *inspired* all at once by the *immediate* Operation of the Spirit; it will be very hard to offer a good reason to any man that has

a minde to be excuſed, why he ſhould go about to *obtain and acquire* it by ordinary means. For whatever *Habit intellectual or moral* he may thus acquire, the Doctor aſſures him, it cannot be Holineſs, *whatever it is beſide.* And I underſtand not what can reaſonably be ſaid to excite a man to endeavour after a thing which is impoſſible to be obtained by endeavour, eſpecially if it be inconſiſtent with the very nature of the thing, to be obtained by endeavouring after it. The Doctor was ſomething aware of the wicked conſequence, and found it needful to ſay, that *Duties,*
P. 420. not proceeding from infuſed Habits, *whether of Morality or Religion, of Piety or divine Worſhip, are good in themſelves, and they ought to be approved, and men encouraged in them.* But upon what ground ſhould they be encouraged? All that he ſays comes to no more than this, that *the World is not in a condition to ſpare the good Acts of bad men.* This, I confeſs, may do ſomething with thoſe Bad men that have ſo much good Nature, as to do good things for the ſake of the *World.* But if this be all the Doctor has to ſay, I ſee not why they ſhould do any thing for the ſake of their own Souls. And therefore if the *World is not in a condition to ſpare the good Acts of Bad men,* the world is little beholden to his Principles, which take away the beſt encouragement they have to do well.

2. This perſwaſion is equally dangerous to the peace and comfort of a good man, who cannot upon this ground be reaſonably ſatisfied of his own good eſtate, if he has either been trained up to Piety and Virtue by a religious Education, or after an ill beginning has arrived to an habi-

tual

tual practiſe of his duty, in the way of induſtry, and by uſing the means of Grace: For how is it poſſible without a new Revelation to know that his habit of Obedience was not acquired but infuſed? In reaſon it ſeems to have been acquired, becauſe he endeavoured after it in the uſe of proper means. And then the Doctor has but little comfort for him: *I have no eſteem*, ſays he, *of that Holineſs as Holineſs, which is not the immediate effect of the Spirit* infuſing it into a mans Soul all at once; for that is his meaning. So that if he judges right, the beſt way that a man can take to be ſure that he is holy, is never to endeavour in the leaſt to be ſo, nor to trouble himſelf with that Preparatory Work, which the Doctor has made a long Chapter of; neither to pray, nor read, nor hear, nor avoid temptations, nor do any thing that is proper to attain an habit of Holineſs; but to live in an utter neglect of all the means of Grace, and to be altogether careleſs of mending his Life: For if while he is in this ſtate he findes himſelf all on a ſudden to become an habitual good man, (as the Elect will ſometime or other) he may be ſure that *Spiritual life is infuſed* into him; and that he is therefore an holy man, becauſe his good habit could not be acquired by the uſe of means, ſince he uſed no means to obtain it, but rather the quite contrary. This is the plain conſequence of his Opinion. P. 454.

Therefore I think Mr. *H.* did well to ſay, *I really believe no Infuſion of Habits.* (I ſuppoſe he means, that God has not ſaid he will infuſe at once a prevailing Inclination to weldoing, equivalent to an Habit, and that we have no reaſon

to

later be ſo. If there be any need to confute this groſs miſtake, it may be done upon the Doctor's
P. 445. conceſſions in another place: *Nothing*, ſaies he, *belongeth unto Holineſs Materially, but what the Goſpel requireth; and nothing in us is ſo Formally, but what we do becauſe it is required.* Therefore where both theſe are, the true Nature of Holineſs is: For, to talk in his *ſubtile* way, the *Matter* and the *Form* conſtitute the Nature of a thing; and the Efficient Cauſe, as the Doctor learnt *forty years ſince*, muſt not go into the Definition of any thing; much leſs the manner in which that Cauſe operates: And yet he hath made both theſe to be part of the Nature of Holineſs, and ſo hath expoſed himſelf to be confuted by every Smatterer in *Logick*. Any one may be ſenſible of the folly of this pretence, by theſe Inſtances. The Apoſtles were by ſudden Inſpiration enabled to ſpeak divers Languages; but if another man ſhould by Study or Converſation attain the skill of ſpeaking the ſame; the Effect is plainly the ſame, though the Cauſes are different; the Skill is the ſame, though *infuſed* into the former, but *acquired* by the later. When our Saviour turned Water into Wine, he added nothing by the miraculous operation to the nature of Wine, which is ſtill the ſame, whether it be produced by a Miracle, or by Gods ordinary bleſſing of Natural Cauſes. In like manner, whether an Habit of Obedience be cauſed by the Operation of the Spirit, (as moſt certainly it is) or not; whether that Operation be *Inſtantaneous* or Gradual, *i. e.* whether the Habit be inſpir'd on the ſudden, (which the Doctor cannot prove that it is) or acquired by God's bleſſing and cooperating with our endeavours, the effect is ſtill the ſame,

ſame, which is a prevailing inclination to obey the whole Will of God, becauſe it is his Will. Farther, the Doctor ſaith, *Our Holineſs is our Obedience:* If therefore an infuſed Habit belongs to the nature of Holineſs, then we are either *commanded* to infuſe an habit, *i. e.* to work a Miracle, to do that which none but God can do; or rather we are commanded that God ſhould infuſe an habit into us. Such Nonſence as this muſt the Doctor maintain, if he will ſtand his ground.

But I muſt confeſs this is an admirable way to ſet Holineſs and Virtue at the greateſt diſtance from one another; for if the Doctor be ſure that there is no other Holineſs but what is irreſiſtibly infuſed, and to the acquiſition or *improvement* whereof (concerning which we ſhall ſee his opinion in the next Chapter) we do not in the leaſt contribute by any care and endeavour of our own, but are purely paſſive in the whole buſineſs: Then I am ſure there can be no virtue in it, no praiſe can belong to that which he calls Holineſs, no more than to a piece of Wood or Stone for its being carved into a beautiful Form and Image by the irreſiſtible hand and tools of the Artificer.

I think it was needful to expoſe this miſtake of his, becauſe it is of very dangerous conſequence.

For 1. If it be believed that nothing is Holineſs but what is *inſpired* all at once by the *immediate* Operation of the Spirit; it will be very hard to offer a good reaſon to any man that has

a minde to be excused, why he should go about to *obtain and acquire* it by ordinary means. For whatever *Habit intellectual or moral* he may thus acquire, the Doctor assures him, it cannot be Holiness, *whatever it is beside.* And I understand not what can reasonably be said to excite a man to endeavour after a thing which is impossible to be obtained by endeavour, especially if it be inconsistent with the very nature of the thing, to be obtained by endeavouring after it. The Doctor was something aware of the wicked consequence, and found it needful to say, that *Duties,*
P. 420. not proceeding from infused Habits, *whether of Morality or Religion, of Piety or divine Worship, are good in themselves, and they ought to be approved, and men encouraged in them.* But upon what ground should they be encouraged? All that he says comes to no more than this, that *the World is not in a condition to spare the good Acts of bad men.* This, I confess, may do something with those Bad men that have so much good Nature, as to do good things for the sake of the *World.* But if this be all the Doctor has to say, I see not why they should do any thing for the sake of their own Souls. And therefore if the *World is not in a condition to spare the good Acts of Bad men,* the world is little beholden to his Principles, which take away the best encouragement they have to do well.

2. This perswasion is equally dangerous to the peace and comfort of a good man, who cannot upon this ground be reasonably satisfied of his own good estate, if he has either been trained up to Piety and Virtue by a religious Education, or after an ill beginning has arrived to an habi-

tual

tual practiſe of his duty, in the way of induſtry, and by uſing the means of Grace: For how is it poſſible without a new Revelation to know that his habit of Obedience was not acquired but infuſed? In reaſon it ſeems to have been acquired, becauſe he endeavoured after it in the uſe of proper means. And then the Doctor has but little comfort for him: *I have no eſteem*, ſays he, *of that Holineſs as Holineſs, which is not the immediate effect of the Spirit* infuſing it into a mans Soul all at once; for that is his meaning. So that if he judges right, the beſt way that a man can take to be ſure that he is holy, is never to endeavour in the leaſt to be ſo, nor to trouble himſelf with that Preparatory Work, which the Doctor has made a long Chapter of; neither to pray, nor read, nor hear, nor avoid temptations, nor do any thing that is proper to attain an habit of Holineſs; but to live in an utter neglect of all the means of Grace, and to be altogether careleſs of mending his Life: For if while he is in this ſtate he findes himſelf all on a ſudden to become an habitual good man, (as the Elect will ſometime or other) he may be ſure that *Spiritual life is infuſed* into him; and that he is therefore an holy man, becauſe his good habit could not be acquired by the uſe of means, ſince he uſed no means to obtain it, but rather the quite contrary. This is the plain conſequence of his Opinion. P. 454.

Therefore I think Mr. *H.* did well to ſay, *I really believe no Infuſion of Habits.* (I ſuppoſe he means, that God has not ſaid he will infuſe at once a prevailing Inclination to weldoing, equivalent to an Habit, and that we have no reaſon to

Diſq. p. 91. to think he does.) *I count that the Spirit by a motion on the Will, exciting it to Act, does encline it to farther Acts by the Impreſſion that is made, and that the Habit then is acquired by the Iteration of thoſe Acts, and delight in them, or love to them ſhed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghoſt.* I think Mr. *H.* had reaſon to ſay this; for the Scripture is ſo far from making *Infuſion of the Habit* neceſſary to Holineſs, that it ſaies not a word of *it.*

Sect. 4.

2. His making a mans being abſolutely *Elected*, neceſſary to the Nature of Holineſs, is a Conceit as unreaſonable, and every whit as dangerous as the former. *Whatever*, ſays he, *there may be in any man of Virtue and Piety, or whether their Endeavours may* p. 442. *be in ways of Honeſty and Duty towards God and Men, if the Power and Principle of it in them be not the fruit of Electing Love, it belongeth not to Holineſs.* This is a very careleſs Saying; for if this Virtue and Piety doth not ſo much as belong to Holineſs, then a man may be his Holy Man, that is Vicious and Impious. But to make the beſt of it; I ſuppoſe he means, that if a man not abſolutely Elected attains the ſame Virtue and Piety which is in one of the Elect, 'tis not Holineſs in the former; becauſe 'tis not the *fruit of Electing Love.* So that *Infuſing* of the Habit, is not ſufficient, it ſeems, unleſs the Perſon be Elected too. The fooliſhneſs of this Opinion is evident from what he ſaith himſelf, *viz.* that *God's chuſing men is the Cauſe and Reaſon why he ſanctifieth them by his Spirit.* For if this were true,

true, it is yet plain, that Election is one thing, and Sanctification another; and though Election were one Cauſe of Sanctification, it is yet no part of it; and if God ſhould ſanctifie one whom he has not abſolutely Elected, this were yet truely and properly Sanctification.

The ill Conſequence of this Opinion is the ſame with that of the former. The temptation it brings to Careleſneſs in a wicked courſe of Life, is ſo evident, that I ſhall ſpend no words about it. And it is as plainly deſtructive of the Comfort of good men; which Objection the Doctor ſeems to have been aware of, and therefore I ſhall ſay ſomething of this. If no Virtue or Piety be Holineſs, but what is the fruit of Abſolute Election, then a man cannot know that he is Holy, till he knows that he is Elected; which upon the Doctor's Principle cannot be known, but by a new Revelation. But, ſaies he, *you may know that the Graces of Holineſs, which you hope are in you, and the Duties proceeding from thence, are fruits of Election,* 1. *By their growth and encreaſe.* Not ſo; for you acknowledge that Moral Virtues may grow, and that Habits of Virtue are *confirmed and encreaſed* by their proper Acts, and that ſuch Acts may be *multiplied* even by the Ungodly. Then 2. *We may diſcern* P. 443. *it, when we are much ſtirred up unto diligent Actings and Exerciſes of Grace, out of a ſenſe of that Electing Love, from whence all Grace doth proceed.* But I demand, what ſhould be the Cauſe of this ſenſe of Electing Love? Is it an Habitual Holineſs of Heart and Life? No; For *nothing is Holineſs, but the fruit* of Election; And therefore I muſt know that I am elected, before I can believe that *the Graces*

Graces of Holineſs which I hope are in me, are indeed the Graces of Holineſs. I think then it muſt be Gods inſpiring into a man the knowledge of his Election; and this is to make new Revelations neceſſary to the comfort of good men. The plain Engliſh of this Doctrine is this; That if a man feels himſelf moved by that love of God towards Mankinde declared in our Redemption by *Jeſus Chriſt*, whereof he ſpake himſelf, *Joh. 3. God ſo loved the world, that he gave his onely begotten Son, that whoſoever believed in him ſhould not periſh, but have everlaſting Life.* I ſay, if he findes himſelf moved by this love of God, to make uſe of the Mercy offered to him, by keeping the Commandments of Chriſt; he has no reaſon from hence to conclude that his Obedience is Holineſs, unleſs he alſo believes that God hath ſo loved him as to elect him abſolutely to Eternal Life. And the true Conſequence of this is, that thoſe Motives and Arguments perſwading to Obedience, which are publickly revealed in the Scriptures, are not ſufficient Motives to Holineſs, unleſs God is pleaſed by private Revelation to make known to me another Motive, which I do not, and cannot finde in the Scriptures. And this, I think, is ſo palpable a Contradiction to what the Scriptures ſay of themſelves, that I need not trouble my ſelf to confute it.

P. 444. Laſtly, ſays he, *Thoſe Graces have the moſt evident and legible Characters of Electing Love upon them, which are moſt effectual in working us into a Conformity unto Chriſt; ſuch as Meekneſs, Humility, Patience, Self-denial, Contempt of the World, readineſs to paſs by Wrongs, to forgive Injuries,*

ries, *to love and to do good to All.* Very good! But theſe are all Moral Virtues, which in your *diſtreſs* it ſeems you can come to, and ſerve your ſelf of them, though you *expelled* them out of your Divinity before. But why ſhould I preſs you any farther, who are falling ſo faſt by your own Pen? Your Contradictions are ſo groſs and palpable, that I think you muſt needs be ſenſible of the badneſs of your Cauſe. I ſhall onely adde, that if at laſt you are forced to lay the ſtreſs of your Comfort upon the plain Virtues and Graces of Chriſtianity, you need not trouble your ſelf to make out your abſolute Election by them; for they will ſecure to you comfort enough, by vertue of the conditional Promiſes of the Goſpel.

CHAP.

CHAP. VII.

Concerning the Work of the Holy Spirit in the Increaſe of Holineſs.

SECT. I.

P. 338. THe Doctor ſaith that *Sanctification is a Progreſſive work*; by which two things may be meant: 1. That a man does not become holy but by degrees. This is not his meaning; For he thinks that the habit of Holineſs is not *Acquired* by frequency of good Actions, through the Grace of God concurring with our endeavours in the uſe of means; but *infuſed* ſuddenly, and in a moment, by an immediate and irreſiſtible Act of the Spirit, as we have ſeen already. 2. That after a man is holy, he may and ought to *grow in Grace, perfecting Holineſs in the fear of God.* This he means, and in this we agree.

But I do not think that *Sanctification* does upon *this account* (or indeed any other) differ from *Regeneration*, as he pretends. *The Work of Regeneration*, ſaies he, *is Inſtantaneous, conſiſting in one ſingle Creating Act. Hence it is not capable of De-*
P. 339. *grees in any Subject. No one is more or leſs Regenerate than another. Every one in the world is abſolutely ſo, or not ſo, and that equally; although there are degrees in their ſtate on other reaſons. But this Work of Sanctification is progreſſive, and admits*

of

of Degrees. One may be more Sanctified, and more Holy than another, who is yet truely Sanctified, and truely Holy. It is begun at once, and carried on gradually. Now in the proper and literal ſence indeed, *no one man* is more or leſs *Born* than another. But the Dr. ſtands too nicely upon the propriety of the Term *Regeneration*, or being *Born again*; and he can never prove, I think, that the Scripture intended to expreſs this meaning by the Metaphor, that all who are Regenerate are *equally* ſo, and that the *New* Birth is as *incapable of Degrees*, as the Natural Birth. The *ſtate* of a Regenerate man, as ſuch, is capable of Degrees: And although the Term *Regeneration*, and that alſo of *Converſion* imply, that his ſtate is changed from what it once was, yet they are uſed to expreſs his continuance in that ſtate, as well as the beginning of it; and therefore if he grows in it, I know no reaſon, why he may not be ſaid to be *more Converted* and *more Regenerate* than he was at firſt. There are Degrees in *Unregeneracy*; And if one man may be more a Child of the Devil, *i. e.* more unregenerate than another; then may one man be more a Child of God, *i. e.* more Regenerate than another. Thus our Saviour ſaid of the Phariſees, that *when they had made a Proſelyte, they made him twofold more the Child of Hell than themſelves*, Matth. 23. 15. To be a Child of Hell more than another, is to be more like to the Devil; more ready to do his works, and to follow his Motions and Suggeſtions: And ſo he is more a *Child* of God, and by conſequence *more Regenerate*, who has more of God's likeneſs, who does more chearfully obey him in all things, and is for this reaſon more beloved of him. The Scripture, for ought I ſee, uſeth

uſeth ſuch expreſſions as theſe, though with great aptneſs, yet without artifice and ſubtlety; nor has the Doctor ſhewn any reaſon from the Scripture, to diſtinguiſh thus nicely between Regeneration and Sanctification. The New Teſtament means the ſame thing under theſe Terms; and therefore the Doctor has not done well to
P. 339. ſay, that the *Work of Sanctification differs from that of Regeneration on divers accounts.* There is no difference on the account of Growth and Increaſe: And let him ſhew a difference upon any other account, if he can. It is not good to vex the Underſtandings of Men with unprofitable niceties in matters of this Concern.

SECT. 2.

But to paſs from words to things; the Doctor pretends to ſhew *wherein* the Increaſe of Holineſs conſiſteth, and *how* it is increaſed. Of the former he ſaith but very little, and 'tis all mixed with his diſcourſe upon the latter. His brevity is not amiſs, unleſs he had been more perſpicuous. But I think that which he would have ſaid, is this, That our Spiritual Growth conſiſts principally in the increaſe of *Faith* and *Love*; upon which our Improvement in other Graces depends. And if this be his meaning, we are of the ſame minde in this matter. I ſhall only offer ſome Illuſtration to it, and that from what he hath ſaid very well concerning the Nature of Holineſs, *viz.* that it conſiſts in doing what God requireth, and this from good Principles, and for good Ends, ſuch, *viz.* as the Goſpel teaches and propoundeth to us. A good man therefore may grow better,

1. In

1. In reſpect of thoſe Principles by which he is moved to do what is good: The beſt is the Love of God and of Righteouſneſs; and therefore the more he is moved by this, the better he is. God has propounded ſeveral motives of Obedience to us, any one of which prevailing, makes way for all the reſt. And he that is univerſally obedient, chiefly perſwaded thereunto by the fear of God's Threatnings, obeys in *Faith*, and not without ſome degree of *Love* to God, who has invited him alſo by his Promiſes. But as this doth increaſe, the man grows better; for it is in it ſelf the moſt excellent Principle, and it does not weaken any other Motive; not that of the fear of Puniſhment, which is by the love of God made leſs troubleſome, not leſs operative. Becauſe a man is greatly moved by the love of God, he will more carefully avoid being excluded from him to Eternity, which is the portion of the Damned. So likewiſe when one is for the beſt reaſons reſolved to perform his duty, under the greateſt temptations to the contrary, he does not the leſs, but the more truſt to God's providence for his preſervation and welfare in this world; as you may ſee in the anſwer of thoſe three worthy men to *Nebuchadnezzar*: *If it be ſo, our God whom we ſerve is able to deliver us from the burning fiery furnace, and he will deliver us out of thy hand, O King. But if not, be it known unto thee, O King, that we will not ſerve thy gods, nor worſhip the golden Image which thou haſt ſet up*, *Dan.* 3. 17, 18. That conſideration which prevailed moſt with them, was the ſenſe of their Duty to God; but yet they did not want that perſwaſion of their being ſafe from all danger under his protection, which in it ſelf is not ſo

worthy a Principle of Obedience as the other. Faith worketh by divers Motives; it worketh by Hope, and Fear; and each of theſe have ſeveral objects: but its beſt operation is that by which the Apoſtle deſcribes the Spirit of Chriſtianity, *Gal.* 5. 6. — *Faith which worketh by Love.* It is in it ſelf the beſt, and it includes all other operations of Faith in good men. And therefore to improve in this, is the principal inſtance of growing better with reſpect to the Reaſons or Motives of Obedience. And where this improvement is, there 2. Obedience in practice will be more perfect; and that not onely becauſe Faith in *Chriſt*, and the Fear of God, and the Hope of his Promiſes, and Loving him with all our hearts, are the matter of ſo many Laws in the Goſpel; for which reaſon to grow in theſe Graces, is to become more perfect in Obedience: but likewiſe becauſe theſe are the Radical virtues of Chriſtianity; and therefore where they increaſe, they will cauſe us to *bring forth more fruit* unto God, in all other kindes of Obedience.

And this is that other reſpect in which a good man ſhould grow in Grace, *viz.* in being more careful not to offend by undue intermiſſion of any Duty; in doing Good with more diligence, in ſuffering Evils with more patience, in being leſs ſubject to intemperate Anger, and to the firſt motions of any inordinate affection; in greater care not to tranſgreſs with the Tongue, aiming at St. *James*'s Character of Perfection; *If any man offend not in word, the ſame is a perfect man*, Jam. 3. 2. Finally, in being more watchful againſt ſins of mere ſurprize, and humane infirmity:

infirmity: To ſuch improvement as this, St. *Paul* exhorted the *Theſſalonians*, beſeeching them although they *walked as they ought*, yet to *abound and increaſe more and more*, 1 Theſſ. 4. 1, 10.

The reſiſting of temptations to ſin with leſs reluctance in our ſelves, and the performance of our duty in all kindes with more readineſs and forwardneſs, is conſequent upon the improvements already mentioned.

And in this ſence we may underſtand that Parable of our Saviours, *Matth.* 13. 33. though I believe it was principally meant of the propagation of Chriſtianity in the world, *The kingdom of Heaven is like unto leaven, which a woman took and hid in three meaſures of meal, till the whole was leavened.* The Spirit of the Goſpel does by degrees diffuſe it ſelf into the whole converſation and temper of a good Chriſtian.

Thus far, I believe, we have no controverſie with the Doctor; and we agree farther, that the Holy Spirit is the cauſe of this proficiency in Holineſs. But the manner of the Spirits Operation in producing theſe effects, is not truely explained by him; and I think his miſtakes in this Queſtion are of dangerous conſequence.

SECT. 3.

He ſaith, that the Spirit increaſeth *Faith* and *Love* in us, by *working immediately an actual increaſe of theſe Graces in us.* If the *immediate* effect of the Spirits Operation in good men be an actual p. 342.

increaſe of theſe Graces, then they need not uſe means for their increaſe; for if this Increaſe be the effect alſo of uſing means, the Spirit doth not *immediately work an actual increaſe of them.* And yet he had ſaid not long before, that the
P. 340. Holy Spirit increaſeth theſe Graces *by exciting them unto frequent Actings:* This therefore is one means of increaſe; therefore it is not wrought *immediately*, but by the intervention of *Frequency*
Ibid. *of Acts*; which, as he very well ſays, *does naturally increaſe and ſtrengthen the Habits whence they proceed.* But indeed he ſuppoſeth the Spirit to cauſe theſe Acts in the ſame manner, wherein he ſays the increaſe of the Habit is cauſed; that is, that
P. 341. the Spirit is the *immediate Author of every good or gracious Acting in us:* And yet he had ſaid not long before, that the Spirit exciteth holy men unto frequent Actings of Faith and Love *by the preaching of the Word*; therefore alſo not *immediately.* When a mans Cauſe will not let him do better, no wonder if he contradicts himſelf now and then. That which the Doctor inſinuates in this Diſcourſe, is, that the Holy Spirit cauſeth the good Actions of holy men, and increaſeth Holineſs in them, in the ſame manner wherein the wicked were before ſaid to be Converted; that is, by an immediate and irreſiſtible Operation. He does not ſeem to be fully ſatisfied in the truth of this opinion, and yet he was reſolved not to deſert it. The main thing which he pretends to prove in that Chapter, of the *Acts and Duties of Holineſs*, is, that the *actual aid, aſſi-*
P. 465. *ſtance, and internal Operation of the Spirit is neceſſary to the producing of every Holy Act of our Minds, Wills and Affections, in every duty whatſoever.* And this he proves ſufficiently for four Pages together,

without

without wandring from the Conclusion: But when he had almost done, and he must now shew himself for his Opinion, or lose his designe, he takes heart, and denies that *God doth onely perswade* the Regenerate (for of them he speaks) *or excite and stir up their Wills by his Grace to put forth their own Acts:* And upon those words of the Apostle, *I laboured abundantly, yet not I, but the grace of God which was with me*; he saith, that *if God doth no more but aid, assist, and excite the Will in its Actings, the Proposition would hold on the other hand; not Grace, but I.* By the way: If St. *Paul* put forth no Act of his own, then the first Proposition, *I laboured*, &c. holds not at all, nor is true in any sence. Again, not long after, he makes every gracious acting of our Mindes to be an *immediate effect of the Almighty efficacy of the Grace of God.* Now, matters being thus ordered, if one of the Doctors Adversaries should tax him for supposing such an irresistible force upon the Minde necessary to the well-doing of the Regenerate, as he had before made necessary for the conversion of the Wicked, away goes the Doctor to the beginning of his Argument, and makes it plain that he meant to prove no more than that the *Assistence* of the Spirit is necessary to every good work. But if one of his Party should upbraid him for giving up part of the Cause, by seeming to contend for no more than the Assistence of the Spirit, he turns presently to the end of his Argument, and shews him that he doth not think Assistence sufficient; but supposes every good Action to be the immediate effect of an Almighty work. But in this case, I think, that is to be reckoned his Opinion, which is contrary to his Adversaries; for otherwise he could have no pre-

P. 471, 472.

increaſe of theſe Graces, then they need not uſe means for their increaſe; for if this Increaſe be the effect alſo of uſing means, the Spirit doth not *immediately work an actual increaſe of them.* And yet he had ſaid not long before, that the
P. 340. Holy Spirit increaſeth theſe Graces *by exciting them unto frequent Actings:* This therefore is one means of increaſe; therefore it is not wrought *immediately*, but by the intervention of *Frequency*
Ibid. *of Acts*; which, as he very well ſays, *does naturally increaſe and ſtrengthen the Habits whence they proceed.* But indeed he ſuppoſeth the Spirit to cauſe theſe Acts in the ſame manner, wherein he ſays the increaſe of the Habit is cauſed; that is, that
P. 341. the Spirit is the *immediate Author of every good or gracious Acting in us:* And yet he had ſaid not long before, that the Spirit exciteth holy men unto frequent Actings of Faith and Love *by the preaching of the Word*; therefore alſo not *immediately.* When a mans Cauſe will not let him do better, no wonder if he contradicts himſelf now and then. That which the Doctor inſinuates in this Diſcourſe, is, that the Holy Spirit cauſeth the good Actions of holy men, and increaſeth Holineſs in them, in the ſame manner wherein the wicked were before ſaid to be Converted; that is, by an immediate and irreſiſtible Operation. He does not ſeem to be fully ſatisfied in the truth of this opinion, and yet he was reſolved not to deſert it. The main thing which he pretends to prove in that Chapter, of the *Acts and Duties of Holineſs*, is, that the *actual aid, aſſi-*
P. 465. *ſtance, and internal Operation of the Spirit is neceſſary to the producing of every Holy Act of our Minds, Wills and Affections, in every duty whatſoever.* And this he proves ſufficiently for four Pages together,

without

without wandring from the Conclusion: But when he had almost done, and he must now shew himself for his Opinion, or lose his designe, he takes heart, and denies that *God doth onely perswade* the Regenerate (for of them he speaks) *or excite and stir up their Wills by his Grace to put forth their own Acts*: And upon those words of the Apostle, *I laboured abundantly, yet not I, but the grace of God which was with me*; he saith, that *if God doth no more but aid, assist, and excite the Will in its Actings, the Proposition would hold on the other hand; not Grace, but I.* By the way: If St. *Paul* put forth no Act of his own, then the first Proposition, *I laboured*, &c. holds not at all, nor is true in any sence. Again, not long after, he makes every gracious acting of our Mindes to be an *immediate effect of the Almighty efficacy of the Grace of God.* Now, matters being thus ordered, if one of the Doctors Adversaries should tax him for supposing such an irresistible force upon the Minde necessary to the well-doing of the Regenerate, as he had before made necessary for the conversion of the Wicked, away goes the Doctor to the beginning of his Argument, and makes it plain that he meant to prove no more than that the *Assistence* of the Spirit is necessary to every good work. But if one of his Party should upbraid him for giving up part of the Cause, by seeming to contend for no more than the Assistence of the Spirit, he turns presently to the end of his Argument, and shews him that he doth not think Assistence sufficient; but supposes every good Action to be the immediate effect of an Almighty work. But in this case, I think, that is to be reckoned his Opinion, which is contrary to his Adversaries; for otherwise he could have no pre-

P. 471, 472.

tence for that invective againſt them, wherewith
P. 470, 471. he concludes his Chapter; *The truth thus confirm'd*, ſaies he, *may be farther improved unto our Inſtruction and Edification.* Now of the two *Uſes* for the *Edification* of his Reader, the Firſt and Longeſt is an Uſe of Railing againſt us, for not being of his Opinion: which ſhould the rather have been ſpared; becauſe he himſelf had much ado to bring it out, as he had good reaſon. For the plain Conſequence of it is this; That the Regenerate are little or nothing better than the Unregenerate: For if the Habit of Holineſs that is infuſed into thoſe (according to the Doctor's Opinion) has made no ſuch Reformation in them, that they can now contribute ſomething to their own weldoing; but ſtill they muſt be wholly paſſive, even in their growing better, and whatſoever good they do, muſt be the Immediate Effect of an *Almighty* force; they ſeem to be as ſtubborn and refractory, and to every good work as reprobate as the worſt of Unregenerate men, in whom God, if he pleaſes, may by an Immediate Operation produce the ſame Effects that he doth in the Regenerate.

But the worſt Conſequence of this Opinion is, That it leads to the neglect of thoſe Means by which Good men may grow better, and without which no man has the leaſt reaſon to think that he ſhall. And therefore the Doctor found it needful to remove that Objection, which he ſaies
P. 345. *we muſt expect to meet with at every turn, viz.* that *if the Beginning and Increaſe of Holineſs, and even all the Acts of Grace, and every Act of it be an Immediate Effect of the Holy Spirit; then what need is there that we ſhould take any pains in this thing our ſelves*

ſelves, &c? So that you ſee he ſuppoſes the Habit and the Acts to be cauſed by the ſame kinde of Operation: and indeed the Objection lies not againſt any other Suppoſition, but that of an Almighty Phyſical Operation, which doth Immediately, and therefore Irreſiſtibly produce the Effect. To the Objection he Anſwers, by calling it *Carnal Reaſoning*, and by proving from Scripture, that we ought to be diligent, and then to depend upon God's Grace; which is very true, but quite againſt him: for this proves, that the Effects of Grace are not wrought *Immediately*, but by the uſe of Means. But whereas he ſaies, P. 346.
Theſe Objectors make the Grace of God an inſuperable Diſcouragement unto Diligence in Obedience: This is mere fooling, for that is not their pretence: They ſay, that his Opinion concerning it, is a dangerous Encouragement to Negligence; and he ſhould have ſhewn the contrary, if he had been able.

It is upon this Suppoſition of an Irreſiſtible work of the Spirit, cauſing a progreſs in Sanctification, that he ſaies, *A River continually fed by* P. 347.
a living Fountain, may ſooner end its ſtreams before it come to the Ocean, as a ſtop be put to the Courſe and Progreſs of Grace before it iſſues in Glory. Indeed if a man perſeveres in weldoing, he ſhall infallibly be ſaved: But that is not all his meaning. He means, that no ſtop can be put to the progreſs of Grace, after the Habit is once infuſed; becauſe the Progreſs it ſelf is as much the Immediate Effect of ſuch an Operation, as that whereby the Habit was Infuſed. For otherwiſe the progreſs might be ſtopt by our own Negligence, as he himſelf frequently acknowledges it is, and thereby contradicts that and ſeveral other

ſuch ſayings in this Diſcourſe. He had ſaid within eight lines before, That *ſome Believers decay for a ſeaſon:* One would think now that ſo long as they *decay*, there is *a ſtop put to the progreſs of Grace before it iſſues in Glory.* Nay, elſewhere he ſaies, that *if men do indulge unto any predominant Luſt, if they live in the Neglect of any known Duty, or the practice of any way of Deceit, he has nothing to offer to them, to manifeſt that Holineſs may thrive in them. For undoubtedly it doth not; but whilſt they abide in ſuch a condition, it will decay more and more. Such are to be warned, to recover their firſt Faith and Love, and to repent and do their firſt works, leſt their end ſhould be Darkneſs and Sorrow for evermore.* So that here he doth not only ſuppoſe that *a ſtop may be put to the courſe of Grace*; but that it may never *iſſue in Glory.*

P. 250, 251.

One would wonder that a man of Underſtanding ſhould contradict himſelf in this faſhion, if it were not plain alſo that he had two works upon his hands, that cannot in reaſon be undertaken by one and the ſame man; that is, on the one hand, to maintain his Opinion of the neceſſary Progreſs of Holineſs in the Regenerate, under the *Immediate* and Irreſiſtible Operations of the Spirit; and on the other, to perſwade them to a diligent uſe of *Means* in order to their growth in Grace; which kinde of Exhortations no man can make ſence of upon the Doctor's *Hypotheſis.* 'Tis juſt as if he ſhoud ſay, that God by his Almighty Power preſerves the lives of men in that manner, that the uſe of Means contributes nothing towards it; and then tries to perſwade them to eat and drink, leſt they be acceſſary to their own Death. He has diſſembled

ſembled his own ſence of the inconſiſtency of theſe things, as well as he can; and yet he has betray'd it, by laying them as far from one another as he could conveniently.

Under pretence of ſatisfying the Complaints of Believers, that are not ſenſible of their own *Thriving*; he begins in the firſt place to ſteal off a little from his Opinion, by telling them, that *according to the ordinary and regular way of the procedure of the Spirit in the work of Sanctification, it is thriving and progreſſive. But if one in whom the work of Sanctification is begun, thrive not in Grace and Holineſs, if he go not from ſtrength to ſtrength, it is ordinarily from his own ſinful Negligence, and indulgence unto carnal Luſts, or love of this preſent World:* So that Holineſs is *ordinarily* Progreſſive; and where 'tis not, *ordinarily* 'tis from our own Luſts. What ſtuff is this! If he had ſpoken plainly according to his *own Principles*, he ſhould have ſaid, that 'tis either *always* Progreſſive; or where 'tis not *Progreſſive*, the reaſon *always* is, that the Spirit doth not think fit to cauſe an actual Increaſe by that his immediate Operation thereof, without which there can be no ſuch Increaſe. But if he had ſpoken according to the *Truth*, he ſhould have ſaid, the true reaſon why we do not grow in Grace, is never becauſe the Holy Spirit is wanting to us; but *always* becauſe we are wanting to our ſelves. He that has a minde to it, may ſee how he ſhifts away from his Principles for four Pages together, till he had left them ſo far behinde, that he might hope they were out of ſight: and then who but the Doctor ſhould ſay, that *although our Sanctification and growth in Holineſs be a work of the* P. 350. P. 350,&c. P. 354.

the Holy Spirit as the efficient cause thereof, yet it is our own work also in a way of duty. He hath prescribed unto us what shall be our part, what he expecteth from us, and requireth of us, that the work may be regularly carried on unto Perfection? Who but he should give warning against *compliance with Temptations*, and the *allowance of any known sin*, as that which will cause an universal decay in Holiness? Nay, he himself does moreover urge the *constant use of all Ordinances and means appointed unto that end* of growing in Grace; and that because *it is the designe of the Holy Ghost in the use of means to carry on the work of Holiness in us:* And therefore *our growth and thriving depends upon our diligence*; which diligence *must be continued to the end, or we cast our selves under decays, and endanger our Souls.*

If the Doctor be more concerned that these good *Instructions* and *Exhortations* should prevail, than he is for the credit of his *Opinions*, I hope he will be the less angry with me for exposing the latter, since he himself seems not to be insensible that they turn the former into Pageantry and Mockery; unless he can reconcile these two Propositions: That *the increase of Holiness is an immediate effect of the Holy Spirit*; and That *it is the designe of the Holy Ghost in the use of means to carry on the work of Holiness*, i. e. to do it *immediately* in the *use of means.*

SECT.

SECT. 4.

It being then in effect concluded between us that good men are not wholly paſſive in their growing better, but muſt do ſomething towards it, it is very reaſonable that they ſhould be exhorted to grow in Grace. There are two very conſiderable Arguments wherewith to perſwade them, which the Doctor has mentioned, *viz.* that this is *frequently enjoyned and frequently promiſed in the Scripture*; *i. e.* God hath commanded us ſo to do; and he hath promiſed that his Grace ſhall not be wanting towards it. To which it may be added; P. 339.

That ſincerity is the main condition of Salvation required in the Goſpel: That it conſiſteth in doing what we can to pleaſe God in all things; and therefore ſince there is room for improvement in the beſt, a ſincere intent towards God cannot ſtand without aiming at the making of our ſelves better than we are.

That this is the beſt way to prevent or to cure the doubts which may ariſe of our Spiritual condition: For God has not ſhewn us the exact limits where the ſtate of Unregeneracy ends, and that of Regeneration begins; that he would therefore have us make our condition comfortable by making it better; and that our ſpiritual joy muſt grow in the ſame proportion wherein the reſt of his Graces are improved in us.

That

That we are to be thankful to God for allowing us time and the assistance of his Spirit for a gradual improvement. We should have thought it very hard, if under penalty of Damnation we were to begin and perfect Holiness all at once. If God has made the *Yoak of Christ easie*, by promising to accept of that perfection which we can attain by degrees, it is an argument of great frowardness and ingratitude, not to use this goodness of God, by growing in Grace, and abounding in the work of the Lord.

That hereby we come to do every thing in Religion with more ease and pleasure, and satisfaction to our selves. The more imperfectly we do any part of our Duty, the less we please our selves with the performance. A man is not weary of praying when he is attentive and devout, but onely when his thoughts are apt to wander. He that forgives an Injury by halves, has much ado within himself before he can come so far: But he that forgives frankly and entirely, suffers little contest within himself about it. The reason why any Command of God seems difficult, and is at any time displeasing to us, is because we do not obey it enough. The better any man is, the more does he finde what *David* knew by experience, that the Commandments of God are a *rejoycing to the Heart*. In the course of a Godly life, the farther we go, the greater strength we obtain: Every step that we take towards Perfection, makes us less weary than we were before: And of those that have made the greatest progress, it is most truely said, that *they shall run, and not be weary; and walk, and not faint.*

Likewise,

Likewiſe, that this is the moſt effectual way to ſecure our perſeverance; ſince the moſt perfect are fartheſt from Apoſtacy, the Habits of Piety and Virtue being in them moſt deeply rooted; the pleaſures of overcoming the World, the Joys of the Holy Ghoſt being by them moſt intimately felt; and the Influences of all divine Grace being to them moſt freely communicated.

Finally, that according as we have been better, and done more good in the World, we may expect more peace at the hour of Death, more joy at the day of Judgement, and a greater Reward in Heaven.

By ſuch Conſiderations as theſe, they that have begun well in Holineſs, are ſtill prompted to go on towards Perfection: And that in the uſe of all means that are proper for their improvement; and which indeed are for the moſt part no other than the means of bringing us to a ſtate of Regeneration at firſt.

To be converſant in the Reading of the Holy Scriptures, is one of them; *We are born again by the Word of God*, 1 Pet. 1. 23. And we muſt *deſire the ſincere milk of the word, that we may grow thereby*, 1 Pet. 2. 2. *Sincere, i. e.* not mixed with Doctrines that gratifie mens ſenſual Luſts, and tend to carnal Security. Many good men had been better, if they had not been miſled into dangerous Miſtakes, and particularly into the belief of thoſe Doctrines, which would make our endeavours in Religion *needleſs* or *unprofitable*. When St. *Peter* ſaith, *Grow in Grace, and in the knowledge*

the Holy Spirit as the efficient cause thereof, yet it is our own work also in a way of duty. He hath prescribed unto us what shall be our part, what he expecteth from us, and requireth of us, that the work may be regularly carried on unto Perfection? Who but he should give warning against *compliance with Temptations*, and the *allowance of any known sin*, as that which will cause an universal decay in Holiness? Nay, he himself does moreover urge the *constant use of all Ordinances and means appointed unto that end* of growing in Grace; and that because *it is the designe of the Holy Ghost in the use of means to carry on the work of Holiness in us*: And therefore *our growth and thriving depends upon our diligence*; which diligence *must be continued to the end, or we cast our selves under decays, and endanger our Souls.*

If the Doctor be more concerned that these good *Instructions* and *Exhortations* should prevail, than he is for the credit of his *Opinions*, I hope he will be the less angry with me for exposing the latter, since he himself seems not to be insensible that they turn the former into Pageantry and Mockery; unless he can reconcile these two Propositions: That *the increase of Holiness is an immediate effect of the Holy Spirit*; and That *it is the designe of the Holy Ghost in the use of means to carry on the work of Holiness*, i. e. to do it *immediately* in the *use of means.*

SECT.

SECT. 4.

It being then in effect concluded between us that good men are not wholly paſſive in their growing better, but muſt do ſomething towards it, it is very reaſonable that they ſhould be exhorted to grow in Grace. There are two very conſiderable Arguments wherewith to perſwade them, which the Doctor has mentioned, *viz.* that this is *frequently enjoyned and frequently promiſed in the Scripture*; *i. e.* God hath commanded us ſo to do; and he hath promiſed that his Grace ſhall not be wanting towards it. To which it may be added; P. 339.

That ſincerity is the main condition of Salvation required in the Goſpel: That it conſiſteth in doing what we can to pleaſe God in all things; and therefore ſince there is room for improvement in the beſt, a ſincere intent towards God cannot ſtand without aiming at the making of our ſelves better than we are.

That this is the beſt way to prevent or to cure the doubts which may ariſe of our Spiritual condition: For God has not ſhewn us the exact limits where the ſtate of Unregeneracy ends, and that of Regeneration begins; that he would therefore have us make our condition comfortable by making it better; and that our ſpiritual joy muſt grow in the ſame proportion wherein the reſt of his Graces are improved in us.

That

That we are to be thankful to God for allowing us time and the assistance of his Spirit for a gradual improvement. We should have thought it very hard, if under penalty of Damnation we were to begin and perfect Holiness all at once. If God has made the *Yoak of Christ easie*, by promising to accept of that perfection which we can attain by degrees, it is an argument of great frowardness and ingratitude, not to use this goodness of God, by growing in Grace, and abounding in the work of the Lord.

That hereby we come to do every thing in Religion with more ease and pleasure, and satisfaction to our selves. The more imperfectly we do any part of our Duty, the less we please our selves with the performance. A man is not weary of praying when he is attentive and devout, but onely when his thoughts are apt to wander. He that forgives an Injury by halves, has much ado within himself before he can come so far: But he that forgives frankly and entirely, suffers little conteſt within himself about it. The reason why any Command of God seems difficult, and is at any time displeasing to us, is because we do not obey it enough. The better any man is, the more does he finde what *David* knew by experience, that the Commandments of God are a *rejoycing to the Heart*. In the course of a Godly life, the farther we go, the greater strength we obtain: Every step that we take towards Perfection, makes us less weary than we were before: And of those that have made the greatest progress, it is most truely said, that *they shall run, and not be weary; and walk, and not faint*.

Likewise,

Likewiſe, that this is the moſt effectual way to ſecure our perſeverance; ſince the moſt perfect are fartheſt from Apoſtacy, the Habits of Piety and Virtue being in them moſt deeply rooted; the pleaſures of overcoming the World, the Joys of the Holy Ghoſt being by them moſt intimately felt; and the Influences of all divine Grace being to them moſt freely communicated.

Finally, that according as we have been better, and done more good in the World, we may expect more peace at the hour of Death, more joy at the day of Judgement, and a greater Reward in Heaven.

By ſuch Conſiderations as theſe, they that have begun well in Holineſs, are ſtill prompted to go on towards Perfection: And that in the uſe of all means that are proper for their improvement; and which indeed are for the moſt part no other than the means of bringing us to a ſtate of Regeneration at firſt.

To be converſant in the Reading of the Holy Scriptures, is one of them; *We are born again by the Word of God*, 1 Pet. 1. 23. And we muſt *deſire the ſincere milk of the word, that we may grow thereby*, 1 Pet. 2. 2. *Sincere, i. e.* not mixed with Doctrines that gratifie mens ſenſual Luſts, and tend to carnal Security. Many good men had been better, if they had not been miſled into dangerous Miſtakes, and particularly into the belief of thoſe Doctrines, which would make our endeavours in Religion *needleſs* or *unprofitable*. When St. *Peter* ſaith, *Grow in Grace, and in the knowledge*

knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jeſus Chriſt; 2 Pet. 3. 18. he ſeemeth to direct us to the increaſing of our knowledge, as to a proper means of growing in every other Grace; and this in purſuance of that advice in the former verſe, not *to be led away with the errour of the Wicked.* Beſides, by being daily converſant in the Scriptures, we make the knowledge and ſenſe of our Duty, as ready and preſent to our mindes, as the daily Temptations to ſin, and occaſions of doing well or ill are. Books that are written to any other good purpoſe but that of practical Religion, may yield all the advantage we can receive from them, by being read once or twice over. But the Scriptures are to be read conſtantly, *though we know them, and are eſtabliſht in the truth*; becauſe it is the preſent ſenſe of thoſe Divine Truths we learn from thence, that muſt enable us to do well under Temptations. No man ever became a good Chriſtian, merely becauſe he once knew why he ſhould be ſo, but becauſe he often conſider'd it. And it is by ſuch Meditation that good men grow better; and therefore they muſt often converſe with the ſame Divine Truths, by reading or attending to the Scriptures, without which we cannot expect to arrive at any conſiderable degree of Virtue and Piety.

Frequent and earneſt Prayer is another Means, as being one Condition upon which the ſpecial Grace of God is ſuſpended, and which alſo does by a Natural Influence cheriſh the principles of true Goodneſs in the Hearts of men. It faſtens the ſenſe of God upon our Mindes; it remindeth us of that Original from whence we came, and keeps the thoughts of that great End, for which we

we were made, alive within us; knowing that we muſt ſhortly come into his preſence, this maketh us careful that we do not put our ſelves into a condition, wherein we ſhall be afraid and aſhamed to appear before him: we ſhall endeavour to walk more worthy of this honour, that with more aſſurance we may offer up our next Devotions at the Throne of Grace. Such are the benefits of praying in good earneſt, at leaſt twice a day, not taking the labour of the lips, or a diſcharge of the memory, or the bare reading of a good Form, for a ſufficient performance; but heartily thinking all that one ſaies, and intending all that he deſires, and compoſing himſelf to that Reverence and Affection, which is due to the Majeſty to whom he ſpeaks. *The effectual fervent Prayer of a righteous man availeth much.*

Deliberation before our Actions, in all matters which adminiſter occaſion of weldoing, and are accompanied with any conſiderable temptation to ſin, is a farther means. For when we are ſurprized, we are often betraid by our own Raſhneſs and Inconſiderateneſs: In moſt caſes the danger might have been foreſeen, and the ſin prevented, by weighing beforehand what was fit to be done, and fortifying our ſelves with ſerious reſolution to do accordingly.

It is another Help; to reflect upon our Actions, and conſider them afterward, which although it cannot make the evil not to have been done, is yet a ſingular good means of preventing the like for the future; ſince a man that makes it his buſineſs to examine and to judge himſelf, will be aſhamed to be found ſtill guilty of the ſame fault.

And

And as for many other reaſons it contributes to Spiritual Improvement in general, ſo it naturally tends to promote Piety and Virtue in ſundry particular Inſtances; in contrition for our ſins, and thankfulneſs for the Grace of God; in a modeſt and humble opinion of our ſelves, in charity and tenderneſs towards others.

For the ſame purpoſe, we are to attend the publick Worſhip of God, and frequently to receive the Lords Supper; one eſpecial uſe whereof is, to renew our former Vows, and to make our greateſt obligations to Chriſtian obedience yet more faſt upon our Mindes.

Finally, the Repetition of any good Action helpeth to increaſe the Habit. By forgiving an Injury, and returning a milde Anſwer to a bitter Provocation, or doing any good work in Charity, or performing any act of religious Worſhip with Devotion, we become more ready to do the ſame thing again. By doing wickedly, the wicked grow worſe; and by doing well, the Righteous grow better.

Now if by ſuch Conſiderations as were before propounded, the Righteous are perſwaded to grow in Grace; if alſo by ſuch means as theſe they perform their intention; then the Operations of the Holy Spirit, whether in diſpoſing or enabling them to perfect Holineſ in the Fear of God, are conſiſtent with the proper uſe and efficacy of thoſe Motives and theſe Helps; and by conſequence are not immediate and irreſiſtible.

Thus

Thus have I ſhewn thoſe miſtakes of Dr. *Owen* concerning the Operations of the Holy Spirit in Preparing, in Regenerating, in Confirming and Improving the mindes of men; which ſeem'd to me to be of Dangerous Conſequence. And though at firſt I deſign'd no more than to Confute them diſtinctly, and to anſwer his ſeveral Arguments; yet upon ſecond thoughts, I ſet my ſelf alſo to purſue the deſigne of the Firſt Part, by ſhewing, where it ſeemed needful, what the Truth is in theſe Queſtions that have been Debated. For to do nothing but confute, tends to expoſe an Adverſary, more than to inſtruct a Learner: And my principal aim was to offer ſome help to thoſe, that had not well conſidered theſe things before. This ought always to be deſigned in Diſcourſes of this nature; but the other is ſometimes needful; and then eſpecially, when the ſubject of the Queſtion is of great concernment, and the Miſtake of very ill conſequence. There are very few Truths in the maintaining of which good Men in former times have been more zealous, and leſs able to bear contradiction, than this, That there is a conſtant Operation of the Holy Spirit upon the minds of men, in framing them to Piety and Goodneſs, and conducting them to Heaven. If the *Denial* of this Truth was deſervedly lookt upon as a moſt dangerous Errour, then ſurely the corrupting of it with Humane Inventions and Falſe Opinions, is not harmleſs, nor eaſie to be endured. If the Belief of it be ſo uſeful and neceſſary, as all good men have thought it, and as indeed it is; it ſhould be the more carefully guarded againſt thoſe Doctrines, which are apt

to render it uſeleſs and unprofitable, and do not tend to make men better, but in truth much worſe than they are. St. *Auſtin* encountred the *Manichees* as vigorouſly as he oppoſed the *Pelagians*. And I doubt not to make it appear, that the Antient Church was as careful to preſerve the *right* perſwaſion concerning theſe Operations of the Holy Spirit, as to maintain that ſuch Operations there are. What *that* is, I have endeavoured to ſhew by *Reaſon*, and by that which ſhould guide all our Reaſoning in theſe matters, the *Holy Scripture*.

You Dr. *Owen* have charged us with Novelty; and to create an Opinion of the Antiquity of your Cauſe, have adorned your Margin with Quotations out of the Fathers. It remains only to ſhew you, that the *Antients* are not for your turn; which through the Bleſſing of God I intend to do in another, and that the laſt Part of this Diſcourſe, which ſhall contain an Hiſtory of their Judgment in theſe Points.

O *Lord of all Power and Might, who art the Author and Giver of all good things; Graft in our Hearts the Love of thy Name, Increaſe in us true Religion, Nouriſh us with all Goodneſs, and of thy great Mercy keep us in the ſame, through Jeſus Chriſt our Lord.*

The End.

Some Books printed for Henry Brome.

DR. *Comber's* Paraphraſe on the Common Prayer, in 4. *vol.* in *Octavo.*
Seneca's Morals in 3. *vol. Octavo.*
Dr. *Heylin* on the Creed. in *fol.*
The Fathers Legacy to his friends containing the whole Duty of Man.
Dr. *Du-Moulins* week of Prayers.
Chriſtianity no Enthuſiaſme.
Dr. *Woodford* on the Pſalms.
----- his Divine Poems.
The Guide to Eternity.
Precepts and Practical Rules for a Truly Chriſtian Life.
Mr. *Camfeilds* Diſcourſe of Angels.
The Reformed Catholick, or the Love of *Jeſus.*
The Lives of the Grand Viziers.
The Hiſtory of the *Sevarites.*
Bp. *Wilkins* Real Character in *fol.*
---his Natural Religion.
The Hiſtory of the *Iriſh* Rebellion in *fol.*
The Life of the great Duke *Eſpernon.*
Montluck's Commentaries, *fol.*
Bp. *Couſens* againſt Tranſubſtantiation.
Mr. *Simpſons* Compendium of Muſick.
Dr. *Combers* Advice to *Roman* Catholicks.
Dr. *Loyd's* ſeveral Sermons and Tracts in Defence of the Church. Mr.

Mr. *Baniſter's* Ayres.
Dr. *Whitby* againſt Hoſt Worſhip.
The Fair one of *Tunis*.
Barbett's practice of Phyſick.
Pool's Parnaſſus in Engliſh.
The Scholars Guide from the Accidence to the Univerſity.
Mr. *Sarazins* Works.
Centum Fabulæ.
Anatomy of the Elder.
Artis Oratoriæ.
Skinner's Lexicon in *fol.*
Education of Children.
Sr. *Kenelm Digby's* Receipts.
Virgil Traveſty.
Lucian Burleſque.
The Exact Conſtable.
The Planters Manual.
The Compleat Gameſter.
Dr. *Gliſſon's* Anatomy.
Gliſſon's Common Law Epitomis'd.
Dr. *Ford's* Sermons on the Man whoſe Legs and Arms rotted off.
Seneca's Morals.
Eraſmus Coll. in *Engliſh*.
Tully's Offices in *Engliſh*.